1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
2	SOUTHERN DIVISION
3	United States of America,
4	Plaintiff,
5	-v- Case No. 19-20259
6	Gemar Morgan,
7	Defendant.
8	/
9	JURY TRIAL - VOLUME 1
10	(EXCLUDING VOIR DIRE AND JURY SELECTION)
11	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID M. LAWSON United States District Judge
12	Theodore Levin United States Courthouse 231 West Lafayette Boulevard
13	Detroit, Michigan November 5, 2019
14	APPEARANCES:
15	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: DAWN ISON
16	ROBERT VAN WERT United States Attorney's Office
17	211 West Fort Street, Suite 2001 Detroit, Michigan 48226
18	IN PRO PER: GEMAR MORGAN
19	FOR THE DEFENDANT MARGARET S. RABEN
20	AS STANDBY COUNSEL: Gurewitz & Raben, PLC  333 West Fort Street, Suite 1400
21	Detroit, Michigan 48226
22	
23	
24	To Obtain a Certified Transcript Contact:
25	Rene L. Twedt, CSR-2907, RDR, CRR, CRC www.transcriptorders.com

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	MATTER	PAGE_
<ul><li>3</li><li>4</li><li>5</li><li>6</li></ul>	GOVERNMENT'S OBJECTION TO DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS Argument By Mr. Van Wert	7 9 10 13
7 8 9	MOTION TO BAR EVIDENCE OF PRIOR CONVICTION Argument By Defendant Morgan	23 25
10 11	MOTION TO DISMISS Argument By Defendant Morgan	
12 13 14 15	OBJECTION TO GOVERNMENT EXHIBITS 2 AND 5 Argument By Defendant Morgan	32 33 34 34
16	(JURY VOIR DIRE AND SELECTION HELD UNDER SEPARATE VOLUME)	
17	Jury Sworn	38
18	PRELIMINARY JURY INSTRUCTIONS	38
19 20	OPENING STATEMENTS For the Government By Ms. Ison	
21	GOVERNMENT'S CASE-IN-CHIEF	
22	WITNESSES:	
23 24	BRIAN KROSS Direct Examination By Mr. Van Wert	
25		

1	WITNESSES:
2	DARREN LONG Direct Examination By Mr. Van Wert
4	JONATHAN COMER Direct Examination By Mr. Van Wert
5	Cross Examination By Defendant Morgan
6 7	Recross Examination By Defendant Morgan
	DAVID SALAZAR
8	Direct Examination By Mr. Van Wert
9	KENTON WESTON
10	Direct Examination By Ms. Ison
11	Redirect Examination By Ms. Ison
12	Further Redirect Examination By Ms. Ison
13	Further Redirect Examination By Ms. Ison
14	Further Recross Examination By Defendant Morgan 178
15	EXHIBITS RECEIVED:
16	Exhibit Number 1
17	Exhibit Number 3
18	Exhibit Number 6 148
19	CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
Detroit, Michigan
 2
     November 5, 2019
 3
     9:22 a.m.
 4
 5
               THE CLERK: All rise. The United States District
 6
      Court for the Eastern District of Michigan is now in session,
 7
      the Honorable David M. Lawson presiding.
 8
               THE COURT: You may be seated.
 9
               THE CLERK: Now calling the case of the United States
10
      against Gemar Morgan, Case Number 19-20259.
11
               THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. Would the
12
      Government attorneys put their appearances on the record,
13
      please?
14
               MR. VAN WERT: Good morning, your Honor.
15
      Van Wert for the United States.
16
               MS. ISON: Good morning, your Honor. Dawn Ison on
      behalf of the United States.
17
18
               THE COURT: And Mr. Morgan, good morning, sir.
19
               THE DEFENDANT:
                              Good morning.
20
               THE COURT: Ms. Raben, you're appearing as standby
21
      counsel for Mr. Morgan?
22
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Margaret Raben as standby counsel
23
      to Mr. Morgan. Yes, sir.
24
               THE COURT: Thank you. You may be seated.
25
               The case is here for trial; however, I had some
```

```
motions that were filed at the last minute that have not been
 1
 2
      addressed.
 3
               The Government has filed two motions objecting to the
 4
      Defendant's exhibits and theory of the case, and the Defendant
 5
      filed a motion to bar evidence of prior convictions under
 6
      Rule 609 and also renewed a motion to dismiss on a
 7
      jurisdictional basis.
 8
         (Pause in the proceedings at 9:23 a.m.)
 9
               THE COURT: I guess I misspoke. The Government
10
      didn't file motions, but the Government did file objections.
11
      They are not characterized as motions.
12
               Ms. Ison, do you want to address the Government's
13
      objection to Number 74, please?
14
               MS. ISON: Your Honor, Mr. Van Wert will do that.
15
               THE COURT: Mr. Van Wert, go ahead.
16
               MS. ISON:
                          Thank you.
17
               MR. VAN WERT: Which objection was that, your Honor?
18
               THE COURT: 74. Docket Number 74.
19
               MR. VAN WERT: Yes, your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: That's the objection to the exhibits.
21
               MR. VAN WERT: Yes, your Honor.
22
               Your Honor, quite frankly, we did object to all three
23
      exhibits.
24
               THE COURT: If you're not by a microphone, you're
25
      going to have to speak up.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
We did object, your Honor, to all
         MR. VAN WERT:
Exhibits A, B, and C, proposed Defense exhibits. Quite
frankly, the Defendant is seeking to admit what appear to be
printouts of no longer valid law and also irrelevant and no
longer legally valid case law.
         The Defendant is attempting to -- quite frankly, if
these exhibits are put in front of the jury, instead of the
jurors being instructed by the law properly by the Court with
the jury instructions, they may be misled with this irrelevant
law that's put forth by the Defendant in Exhibits A, B, and C,
your Honor. He cites to an improper statute.
         THE COURT: You mean he cites an improper statute?
         MR. VAN WERT: He does, your Honor. I believe he has
cited to a --
         THE COURT: No, he doesn't cite to anything.
         MR. VAN WERT: You're correct. I apologize.
included a -- what appears to be a printout of some form of
922 that's not the current valid version of 922 which is
relevant in this case.
         THE COURT: Oh, I'm not sure. I think it's the
current version, it's just not the one that applies here.
         MR. VAN WERT: Correct. Correct. He also cites a
portion of the case of United States v. Bass, which does not
apply to 922(g) cases.
```

And he also attaches portions of the United States

```
Constitution, various amendments to that Constitution.
 2
               THE COURT: You're not suggesting that's expired, are
 3
      you?
 4
               MR. VAN WERT: No, your Honor, absolutely not, your
 5
      Honor, that is still valid law. However -- however, the
 6
      Defendant's concerns or what is proper to be put in front of
 7
      the jury for the sake of law will come from the Court in the
      form of the jury instructions.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Well, that's the core argument; correct?
10
               MR. VAN WERT: Yes, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: That this is not something for the jury
12
      to consider.
13
               MR. VAN WERT: Correct, your Honor. Thank you.
14
               THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, do you want to respond to
15
      that?
16
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes, your Honor.
17
               Actually, the exhibits that I provided and submitted
18
      to the courts, the 922(q) is the new version of 922(q).
19
      Title 18 is from LexisNexis, the redefined definition, the
20
      922(q).
21
               And also, I also got, like, you know, definition of
22
      Supreme Court's ruling on the proper commerce clause.
23
               And I got case law from Garcia, 143 F. Supp 2d 791,
24
      describing the use of a gun manufactured in another state
25
      which do apply to this situation.
```

And also I have another page from the Garcia case that defines the proper commerce clause.

THE COURT: Well, the argument, Mr. Morgan, is that these are not proper exhibits to submit to the jury because they are statements of the law. They don't address any of the facts that are at issue in the case.

The Government argues, and I believe correctly, that the jury must take their law that they are to apply from my instructions, not from exhibits or from argument by you. The sole source of law in a trial that the jury applies comes from the Judge, not from the parties, and your exhibits don't address any of the factual issues in the case.

The elements in the case are whether you possessed a firearm; secondly, whether at the time you possessed the firearm you had previously been convicted of a felony; and then finally, whether the gun was -- had traveled in interstate commerce. Those are factual issues, and your exhibits don't address any of those. So the Government objects to them. Do you have any response to that?

DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes. Actually, the commerce clause definitions that I have, it do properly define the interstate commerce definition which do apply to this current situation.

THE COURT: Well, maybe as a matter of law, and you can argue that when it comes time to discuss the jury

```
instructions, but those are not exhibits that the jury will
 1
 2
      see, because the jury takes its law from me, not from you.
 3
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Right. What about up under the
      Federal Rules of Evidence 402, United States statute, federal
 4
 5
      statute?
 6
               THE COURT: I'm sorry, what are you asking about?
 7
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Up under Federal Rules of Evidence
 8
      402, it states that I can submit United States federal
 9
      statutes.
10
               THE COURT: No, it doesn't. Rule 402 deals with
11
      relevant evidence, and the evidence in the case has to do with
12
      whether the relevant evidence in the case is evidence that
13
      might have a tendency to establish a fact; that is, a fact of
14
      consequence to the determination of the action, whether it's
15
      more likely or less likely than it would be without the
                 That has nothing to do with statements of the law.
16
      evidence.
17
      Do you understand that?
18
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
19
               THE COURT: All right. Do you have any further
20
      response?
21
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Just a second.
22
         (Discussion held off the record at 9:32 a.m.)
23
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  No.
24
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
25
               The Government's objection will be sustained.
```

```
Court will not receive Exhibits A, B, or C of the Defendant.
 2
      The jury will not see those and they will not be submitted to
 3
      the jury.
 4
               The next objection is Objection Number 75, and that's
 5
      the objection to the defense theory. I'm not sure that that
 6
      plays much of a role here, but Mr. Van Wert, are you taking
 7
      that one too?
 8
               MR. VAN WERT: Yes, your Honor.
 9
                          Let me hear your argument, what your
               THE COURT:
10
      concern is.
11
               MR. VAN WERT: Well, your Honor, regarding
12
      Mr. Morgan's theory of defense that he has submitted, a
13
      Defendant's only entitled to have his defense theory put
14
      before the jury as long as there is basis for it in the law
15
      and the facts that will come out at trial.
16
               Judge, Mr. Morgan's theory of defense --
               THE COURT: Are you anticipating a jury instruction
17
18
      argument here?
                            But I think -- well, essentially, what
19
               MR. VAN WERT:
20
      Mr. Morgan is attempting to do is have his theory of defense
21
      included in the jury instructions or to have the Court
22
      instruct the jury as to his theory of defense. I believe it's
23
      Jury Instruction 6.1 which allows for the theory of defense to
24
      be given to the jurors by the Court and that's what Mr. Morgan
25
      has submitted.
```

Our objection to that is that it's Mr. Morgan's -the body of his theory of defense is rife with incorrect
statements of the law, incorrect arguments regarding his
status as a derivative person under the statute.

He starts out by including an incorrect definition of the term "felon" as opposed to the correct version that's listed in 921(a)(20) which defines it as a person convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for more than one year.

Mr. Morgan puts -- vaguely puts forth an entrapment defense, and then Mr. Morgan argues that his -- his -- that he is not prohibited from possessing a firearm because more than three years has passed since his felony convictions; however, Mr. Morgan applies the wrong portion of the Michigan Code, Section 750.224f.

Mr. Morgan attempts to apply subprovision (1) which pertains to individuals who are convicted of felonies that are not specified offenses. However, in dealing with Mr. Morgan's State of Michigan conviction for armed robbery, armed robbery is a specified offense in the State of Michigan; therefore, Section 224f, subsection (2) applies, which imposes an additional requirement in order to have your rights restored, meaning that Mr. Morgan would have to petition the Circuit Court in the county where he resides for an order restoring those rights.

Mr. Morgan has not put forth any evidence that he has

```
He has not provided an order from any Circuit Court
 2
      in Michigan restoring those rights.
 3
               THE COURT: Well, even if he did, would that have any
 4
      effect on Section 922(g)?
 5
               MR. VAN WERT: It would not in Mr. Morgan's case,
 6
      because --
 7
               THE COURT: Well, in any case?
 8
               MR. VAN WERT: It does. In certain situations, if an
 9
      individual is successful in petitioning the Circuit Court,
10
      technically under the law a Circuit Court can restore an
11
      individual's rights.
12
               THE COURT: Not the right to possess a firearm as
      under federal law.
13
14
               MR. VAN WERT: Not under federal law, no.
15
      especially in Mr. Morgan's case, because he does have a --
               THE COURT: We are in a federal court.
16
17
               MR. VAN WERT: Absolutely. Well, and in addition,
18
      in Mr. Morgan's case he does have another federal felony
19
      conviction for felon in possession of a firearm, and
20
      Mr. Morgan does not address that conviction either.
21
               So his theory of defense misstates the law, misstates
22
      the law's application to his situation, and again, would do
23
      nothing but confuse the jury as to the correct law and the
24
      issues that are relevant in this case.
25
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Morgan, do you have a
```

response?

DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes, your Honor. My theory of defense asserts the rights that, you know, I was given up under the United States Constitution amendments. The definition of "felon" that I did, you know, define up under my theory of defense was from Case Maker law library and it is up to date.

THE COURT: Well, I appreciate that, Mr. Morgan.

Here's my concern: You're not correct. You misunderstand the law. And your definition of "felon" is not the definition that governs this case. The statute, 924 -- 922(g) of

Title 18 says that if a person had been convicted of a felony, that is, a crime punishable by more than a year in prison, then the person is prohibited from possessing a firearm.

Now, my concern is that you might be attempting to go to trial here based on your understanding of what you believe the law is, but it's not correct, so that you would be trying to put forth a defense that is irrelevant, that the jury cannot even consider.

So I know you're challenging whether you have been convicted of a felony or not. The Government will be offering proofs to show that you were convicted of armed robbery and that you also were convicted of being a felon in possession of a firearm. Both of those are qualifying felonies that would disqualify you from possessing a firearm.

The second defense you're attempting to put forth has to do with whether the gun was in or affecting commerce, but the law from the Supreme Court and from the Circuit clearly state -- states that if the -- if you possessed a gun in a state other than the weapon's state of manufacture, then that satisfies that element of the crime.

Now, you can try to defend that if you want, but the

Now, you can try to defend that if you want, but the jury will not be instructed on that theory because it's not a correct statement of the law. Do you understand that?

DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

DEFENDANT MORGAN: May I speak on that behalf?

THE COURT: Yes, you may. Go ahead.

DEFENDANT MORGAN: According to case law that I have, it say: "The use of a gun manufactured in another state, neither does the use of a gun manufactured in another state constitute engaging in interstate commerce. Because there are no gun manufacturers in Michigan, virtually every gun comes from another state; thus, any gun used in a state that does not manufacture guns necessarily involves the accusation" -- "acquisition of a product that moved in interstate commerce.

"If the use of a gun manufactured in another state supplied the jurisdictional hook for whether an action constitutes engaging in interstate commerce, then every crime committed in Michigan with a gun or any other weapon not

manufactured here would potentially be subject to federal criminal jurisdiction. This is not the law.

"If it were, then whether or not federal criminal jurisdiction attaches would depend upon where weapons are manufactured. The gun used here were the implement by which members carried out alleged criminal activity. The gun may have been involved in interstate commerce, but not the enterprise, as the statute required.

"The Supreme Court made clear in American Building Maintenance that the purchase from a local supplier of goods which traveled at one time in interstate commerce does not constitute engaging in the acquisition of goods in interstate commerce. The Court found that the janitorial services suppliers could not be said to have engaged in commerce based on the allegations that the company made local purchases of equipment and supplies that were" -- "that were manufactured in another state.

"Although the Benton companies used janitorial equipment and supplies manufactured in a large part outside of California, they did not purchase them directly from suppliers located in other states; rather, those products were purchased in intrastate transactions from a local distributor. Once again, therefore, the Benton companies were separated from direct participation in interstate commerce by the pricing and other marketing decisions of independent

```
intermediaries. By the time the Benton companies purchased
 1
 2
      their janitorial supplies the flow of commerce had ceased."
 3
               And I also have another one.
 4
               THE COURT: Well, wait. Before you do put that down,
 5
      you were reading from a case, weren't you?
 6
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yeah. A case that the --
 7
               THE COURT: What's the name of that case?
 8
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: That's Garcia versus United
 9
      States.
10
               THE COURT: Is that the one that Judge Edmunds
11
      decided?
12
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I really -- the case I got is --
13
      it came from the United -- I mean, the U.S. Supreme Court.
14
               THE COURT: The case that you were reading from is a
15
      District Court case, I believe, and the statement of the law
      there is correct, but it doesn't apply to the crime that
16
17
      you're charged with.
18
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I have another one from the
19
      Supreme Court.
20
               THE COURT: Well, you know, you're charged with being
21
      a felon in possession of a firearm. You're not charged with
22
      engaging in a racketeer influenced and corrupt organization
23
      activity, you're not charged with selling firearms, and you're
24
      not charged with using a firearm in connection with another
25
      felony. You're simply charged with possessing a gun that has
```

some connection with interstate commerce.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
And the law is quite clear that if you are in
Michigan and you possess a gun that was manufactured in a
state other than Michigan, I believe the state of manufacture
here is either Nevada or California, then that satisfies
that element of the crime. And that's what the jury will be
instructed on, and you will not be permitted to argue
something else, because that's not what the law is.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: Could I read from this section?
         THE COURT: Yes. Tell me what you're reading from
first.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: It's from the Garcia case, too.
         THE COURT: Okay. And do you have a citation for the
Garcia case there?
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes. 143 F.Supp. 2d 791.
         THE COURT: Yes.
                          Decided what year?
         DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                           2000.
         THE COURT: 2000.
                           Okay. Go ahead.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: "The Court rejected the
Government's submission concerning purported ties to the
interstate commerce emphasizing that the term used, in and
affecting commerce, is most sensibly read to mean active
employment for commercial purposes and not merely a passive
passing or past connection to commerce."
        And that came from the same citing.
```

THE COURT: Right. Which -- in which the defendants were not charged with being felons in possession of a firearm. It's a different crime. The case does not apply here.

DEFENDANT MORGAN: I understand that, but it actually clarified interstate commerce, that the current case I'm facing is adopting for this charge.

THE COURT: Let me just suggest to you this: There is a case called Scarborough versus the United States. It's a United States Supreme Court case that was decided in 1977. In that case the interstate nexus element, the Supreme Court says, is satisfied if there is proof that the firearm previously traveled in interstate commerce.

And then in 1989, the Sixth Circuit decided a case called United States versus Pedigo. And in that case the Court said that the element is met if the defendant possessed the firearm outside of its state of manufacture. That's the -- that's the law, Mr. Morgan, and that's the law that the jury will be instructed on.

Now, the reason I take pains to tell you about this is because I'm concerned that based upon your misunderstanding you might be going to trial to assert a defense that is inapplicable. In other words, based upon what you're trying to say, your position is indefensible.

Now, many times people go to trial on felon in possession cases because they dispute whether or not they

actually possessed the gun. Now, I don't know what the facts are behind that element here in this case, but if you have a defense, a factual defense that you were not in possession of that gun, then we can hear proofs on that and the jury will decide based upon the evidence.

But if you're arguing about whether the gun was -traveled in interstate commerce based upon your theory, that's
a non-starter. And if you're arguing that you are not a felon
because you're not currently serving a sentence, that's a
non-starter, too. That's simply an incorrect statement of
the law.

DEFENDANT MORGAN: (Gesturing.)

THE COURT: Yes.

DEFENDANT MORGAN: Well, I had my rights restored through the State of Michigan and through the transportation TSA and the Department of Homeland Security.

THE COURT: I respectfully disagree that you did not have your rights restored and the jury will not be instructed on that either.

Now, if you want to take that position, as you had in your motions to dismiss, then you can ask an appellate court whether or not I have correctly ruled on that issue, but at this point the issue is settled, that you have not had your rights restored, that you are a convicted felon, and you are a prohibited person. So if the Government proves that you

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

17

18

24

```
possessed this Raven Arms handgun, then the jury will have
      sufficient evidence to base a conviction, if they choose to
 3
     do that.
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  (Gesturing.)
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: In 2014 I was -- I had to apply
      for a hazmat endorsement that was, you know, part of my CDLs
      and through that I had to --
               THE COURT: When you say "CDL" you mean commercial
10
      driver's license?
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  Yes.
               THE COURT: Okay.
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: As part of that I had to petition
      for the Circuit Court for background clearance in order to
15
      submit a background clearance to the TSA and Homeland
      Security. And I got the background clearance from the
16
     Circuit Court and I submitted it to the TSA for the background
      clearance through they requirement. So I met the requirements
19
      of having the background clearance.
20
               THE COURT: And tell me how that restores your
21
      rights.
22
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Due to the fact that I went -- I
23
     went with -- first of all, back in 2000 and -- what, I think
      it was like '11 and '12 when I applied, they told me I didn't
     meet the credentials because I haven't, you know, had enough
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

time, you know, off of papers and stuff like that. So in 2014

```
when I applied they said that I met the credentials. So I put
in the application to get the clearance from the Circuit
Court, and then I had to pay $89 to TSA to do a background
check with the result, the clearance from the Circuit Court,
and in March of 2014 they approved me for the background
clearance to have the hazmat endorsement.
         THE COURT: All right. So you added a hazmat
endorsement, hazardous materials endorsement to your
commercial driver's license.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
         THE COURT: That didn't have anything to do with a
gun.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: Could I ask a question?
         THE COURT: Go ahead.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: And part of the statute states
that you can't ship, receive, transport, up under the
credentials of a felon. When they cleared me to -- when
they cleared me in 2014, I was endorsed to transport
everything from explosives, which falls up under the terms of
firearms, all the way to marine pollutants, you know, just
about everything up under the hazmat table.
         THE COURT: Well, maybe you did. Doesn't change
things, though, about whether you were a prohibited person
from possessing a firearm.
```

```
Now, that being the case, I will sustain the
 1
      Government's objection to your proposed theory of the case.
 2
 3
               Now, you have a motion to bar evidence of a prior
 4
      conviction under Rule 609?
 5
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                 Yes.
 6
               THE COURT: Do you want to address that?
 7
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  Yes.
               Defense notes that Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 609
 8
 9
      bars the Government from entering into evidence any of his
10
      prior conviction on the grounds of certificate of rehab,
11
      governed in Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 609(b)(2) and
12
      (c)(1).
               Defense would like to assert for the record Federal
13
14
      Rules of Evidence Rule 609, impeachment by evidence of a
15
      criminal conviction, (b), limits on using the evidence of a
16
      criminal conviction after ten years.
                                            The subdivision (b)
17
      applies if more than ten years have passed since the
      conviction or release from confinement; whereas, the
18
19
      Government Exhibit 5 conviction 98-10382 has passed the ten
20
      years that Rule 609(b) bars as evidence, as well in (c)(1) of
21
      this rule promises that has been the subject of certificate of
22
      rehabilitation or other equivalent procedures based on a
23
      finding that the person has been rehabilitated.
24
               Defense asserts Rule 609(b)(2) and (c)(1) as the
25
      authority to exclude the Government Exhibit 3 and 4,
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

```
06-CR-00190, and Exhibit Number 5, 98-10382. Both convictions
are a conviction of (c)(1), certificate of rehabilitation, and
number -- and Number 5 of the Government exhibit meets (b) (2)
and (c)(1) of Rule 609 which exclude the Government from using
the past conviction as evidence.
         Due to the rule -- due to Rule 609(b)(2) ten-year
limit and (c)(1) certificate of rehabilitation, the Defense
requests that the Court honor Rule 609(b)(2) and (c)(1) in
this matter as the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States
Constitution promises equal protection of the law with
granting this motion Rule 609(b)(2) and (c)(1) motion to bar
the Government from entering past conviction that Rule 609
authorized from the Government -- authorized from the
Government inflicting harm, error, abuse, and prejudice.
         Respectfully, Gemar Morgan.
         THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Morgan.
         Who is responding to that? Mr. Van Wert?
         MR. VAN WERT: Yes, your Honor.
         THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
        MR. VAN WERT: Just very briefly, Judge.
```

We're not seeking to admit the prior convictions under Rule 609. 609 only applies if the Government were to attack Mr. Morgan's character if he were to testify. We're not using the convictions to impeach his character. We're using it to satisfy an element of the 922(g) offense. So

```
609 does not apply to the Government's use of Mr. Morgan's
 2
      prior convictions.
 3
               THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, do you understand what
 4
      that -- what the Government is saying there?
 5
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Not really.
 6
               THE COURT: All right. Rule 609 is a rule of
 7
      evidence. Under the Rules of Evidence when a witness
 8
      testifies the opposite side can challenge the witness's
 9
      credibility in a number of ways. One way of challenging
10
      credibility is to attack the witness's character for
11
      truthfulness, and one way to attack character for truthfulness
12
      is to show that the witness had previously been convicted of a
13
      felony.
14
               The idea being that if a witness is not inclined to
15
      honor the rules of society, and therefore, commits a crime,
16
      that witness also is less likely to honor the oath to tell the
17
      truth. Do you follow me so far?
18
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  Yes.
19
               THE COURT: Okay. Now, if a witness has been
20
      previously convicted of a felony and testifies, then the
21
      Government can use that previous conviction --
22
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: (Gesturing.)
23
               THE COURT: Just let me finish.
24
               The Government can use that previous conviction to
25
      attack the witness's credibility. But the limits are that the
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

conviction can't be stale. So if the conviction is more than ten years old, the Government cannot offer that conviction into evidence for that purpose to attack the witness's credibility, but it may be offered in evidence for another purpose. And the purpose the Government claims here is to show that one of the elements of the crime is satisfied; that is, that you were previously convicted of a felony, because there is no time limitation under the felon in possession statute. The evidence is offered for a different purpose. Do you understand that? DEFENDANT MORGAN: No. Because the 609 up under the Federal Rules of Evidence that I citated --THE COURT: Yes. DEFENDANT MORGAN: -- it didn't mention anything about witness testimony. THE COURT: It does. It says, "The following rules apply to attacking a witness's character for truthfulness by evidence of a criminal conviction." So if the Government were to attack your character for truthfulness by using that conviction, then the limitations in Rule 609 would apply. But the Government is not offering the evidence for that purpose. Now, if you look at Rule 105, Rule 105 says that evidence can be offered for multiple purposes, and if it's

offered for multiple purposes, one a proper one and the other

```
an improper one, then you're entitled to a limiting
 2
      instruction.
 3
               So if you were to testify in this case I would
 4
      instruct the jury that it should not consider your prior
 5
      convictions on your character for truthfulness, but the jury
 6
      can consider your prior convictions on whether you are a
 7
      prohibited person because you were a felon when you possessed
 8
      the firearm. That would be my instruction.
 9
               Do you understand that?
10
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I would have to say no, because
11
      like I said, the --
12
                          Well, I'm not asking if you agree with
13
      me, I'm just asking if you understand.
14
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  No.
               THE COURT: You don't understand?
15
16
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  No.
17
               THE COURT: All right. Let me try to put it this
18
            The ten-year limit does not apply if the Government
      way:
19
      offers your conviction to show that you are a felon.
2.0
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Could you repeat that?
21
               THE COURT: Yes.
22
               The ten-year limitation in Rule 609 does not apply if
23
      the Government offers your prior conviction for the purpose of
24
      proving that you're a felon, and therefore, a prohibited
25
      person under the firearm statute.
```

```
DEFENDANT MORGAN: I respect what you saying, your
 1
 2
     Honor, but like I say, the rule that I, you know, citated, it
     doesn't mention anything about a witness or the credibility
 3
 4
     of -- it talks about a person's prior conviction. It don't
 5
     mention anything about a witness or they credibility to
 6
     testify.
 7
               THE COURT: It does. Do you have the rule there?
 8
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yeah.
                                         I got the --
 9
               THE COURT: Do you see 609(a), "In general," do you
10
      see that?
11
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I can read it out this book.
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
12
13
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Okay. "Impeachment by evidence of
14
     a criminal conviction. In general, the following rules apply
15
      to attacking a witness character for truthfulness or evidence
16
      of a criminal conviction."
17
               THE COURT: There, that's what it says.
18
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Oh, okay. The law library that I
19
     go off of, it didn't have this part, but I see now.
20
               THE COURT: See what I'm talking about now?
21
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yeah.
22
               THE COURT: Okay.
                                 So that motion is denied.
23
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  Okay.
24
               THE COURT: Your next motion is another motion to
25
      dismiss under Rule 12(b)(2) arguing that there is no nexus to
```

```
interstate commerce, but we have already discussed that.
 2
               Do you understand the position of the Court that your
 3
      argument does not have merit?
 4
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: No, because I got case laws that
 5
      defines interstate commerce as, you know, for example --
 6
               THE COURT: I know you read to me from the Garcia
 7
      case.
 8
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yeah. It defines it in a
 9
      different manner than the Court is stressing.
10
               THE COURT: Right. But I'm telling you that the way
11
      I read it, the case law that you cited does not apply to this
12
      situation, and it does not govern the rules that we will go
13
      forward with in this trial.
14
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: So the question I have for the
15
      Court is, I'm charged with being -- part of that because it
16
      say possessing in interstate commerce. Am I being charged
17
      with being regulated up under the commerce clause?
18
               THE COURT: No. You're regulated under the criminal
19
      code.
20
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Because my understanding of the
21
      commerce clause is that Congress had the power to regulate
22
      commerce and that's transportation. So I don't understand how
23
      the -- according to the laws that I, you know, recited and
24
      researched, I don't understand how I can fall up under a
25
      federal jurisdiction when it don't allege that I transported
```

```
the firearm.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: It doesn't allege that you transported
 3
      anything. It alleges that the gun had been transported. It
 4
      doesn't have to be by you. If the gun was transported in
 5
      interstate commerce, that satisfies the element of that crime.
 6
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yeah, but the Congress got the
 7
      power to regulate commerce, not manufacturing. According to
      Garcia, the use of a gun in Michigan, according to that --
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Well, okay, Mr. Morgan. I appreciate
10
      your viewpoint. I'm not going to debate the point with you,
11
      though.
12
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Okay.
13
               THE COURT: I'm going to tell you, though, that the
14
      law that I will apply in this case is this: If the Government
15
      proves that the gun was possessed by you and that gun had been
16
      manufactured in a state other than Michigan, then the jury
17
      will be free to conclude that that element has been satisfied
18
      and that the gun traveled in interstate commerce. Do you
19
      understand?
2.0
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  No.
21
               THE COURT: All right.
22
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I mean, unless it's proven.
23
               THE COURT: Unless what's proven?
24
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: That it traveled in interstate
25
      commerce.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Right. If the gun was not manufactured
in Michigan, it was manufactured in another state and the gun
was found in Michigan, then I suggest to you that the law
says that that is sufficient proof that the gun traveled in
interstate commerce.
         Now, you may not like that, but that's what the cases
say.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: It ain't about what I like, your
        It's about the case laws that I recited and the
Honor.
definition that came from the case law.
         THE COURT: I agree with you, it's not about what you
like.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yeah.
         THE COURT: It is about what the law is. And I'm
telling you what I believe to be the law and the law that will
be applied in this case. Do you understand?
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes, your Honor.
         THE COURT: All right. So that's my ruling.
motion to dismiss, the renewed motion to dismiss Docket
Number 77 is denied.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: Okay.
         THE COURT: Now, I don't think that -- I think that
takes care of all the motions.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: No.
         THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, did you have something else?
```

```
1
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes. I got an objection to the
 2
      Government proposed -- oh, on Docket Number 70.
 3
               THE COURT: Number 70?
 4
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
 5
               THE COURT: Okay. I'm not sure that I know what that
 6
      one is.
 7
               Oh, that's objecting to the admission of the
      ammunition?
 8
 9
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: 2 and 5.
               THE COURT: Exhibits 2 and 5?
10
11
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
12
               THE COURT: 2 is the ammunition. 5 is a certified
13
      copy of your -- of a conviction. I'm not sure what that
14
      conviction means.
15
               But let's talk about Number 2 first.
16
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Okay. Accused's objection to
17
      Government Proposed Exhibit 2. The Government proposed to
18
      admit ammunition as its Exhibit 2. Defendant objects to the
19
      exhibit because possession of ammunition is a separate crime
20
      and Defendant is not charged with the crime of possession of
21
      ammunition, and because under Federal Rules of Evidence 403,
22
      this evidence is more prejudicial than probative and will
23
      confuse the jury.
24
               THE COURT: Okay. I understand your argument.
25
               Mr. Van Wert?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
MR. VAN WERT: Just very briefly, Judge. We can
probably make this pretty simple. Initially the Government
was going to admit the ammunition or a photograph of the
ammunition. At this point in time we're not planning on doing
so; however, at the same time -- however, depending on how the
proofs come out and depending on how Mr. Morgan may or may not
cross examine the witnesses, that may be relevant at some
point in time.
         It's our standpoint that the ammunition is still
relevant and we -- because, quite frankly, a firearm is
defined as a weapon which will or is designed or may readily
be converted to expel a projectile by an action, so the fact
that the gun is actually loaded with ammunition or is capable
of being loaded with ammunition goes to whether or not that
weapon at issue is a firearm by statute.
         THE COURT: Will the proofs show that the weapon,
when it was seized, was loaded?
         MR. VAN WERT: Yes, they will, your Honor.
         THE COURT: And is the ammunition that you intend to
offer ammunition that fits the weapon?
         MR. VAN WERT: It was taken from that weapon and it
does fit that weapon, yes, your Honor.
         THE COURT: Okay. All right. So at this point in
time you don't intend to offer it?
         MR. VAN WERT: We do not, your Honor. Partially,
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
quite frankly, based upon the Court's order not allowing the
ammunition into court. We do have photographs of it, but at
this point in time we're going to forgo admitting that as an
exhibit; however, again, depending on how the proofs come
out and how the Defendant may or may not cross examine the
witnesses, we would like to reserve the right to admit it at
trial if it becomes an issue.
         THE COURT: All right. This is what I'm going to do,
            I'm going to deny your motion as moot because
Mr. Morgan:
the Government does not intend to offer the ammunition into
evidence.
         If the Government changes its mind, I'll direct the
Government to take that up outside the presence of the jury
before you mention the ammunition or offer it into evidence.
        MR. VAN WERT: Yes, your Honor. We will. Thank you.
         THE COURT: And we can argue it at that time.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: Okay.
         THE COURT: Now, what is Exhibit Number 5?
         I'm not sure what certified conviction that refers
to.
         Oh, wait a minute. I might have that here.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: Oh, it's the --
         THE COURT: That's the armed robbery conviction?
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
         THE COURT: And what's the problem with that?
```

DEFENDANT MORGAN: The Government proposed to admit a certified copy of conviction in Case Number 98-10382. I object under Federal Rules of Evidence 403. The Government only has to prove a prior felony conviction which the Government intends to do with the record from Case Number 06-00190. Federal Rules of Evidence 403 says evidence should be excluded if it is more prejudicial than probative evidence.

More conviction is more prejudicial than probative because the only purpose is to make me look bad in the eyes of jury and a 1998 conviction is not relevant to any issue the Government needs to prove if the evidence of the 2'06 conviction is admitted. I ask the Court to exclude the Government's Proposed Exhibit 5.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. VAN WERT: Thank you, your Honor.

Judge, based upon the recent Supreme Court decision in Rehaif the Government now needs to prove the Defendant's knowledge of his status as a person who was convicted of a crime punishable by more than one year in prison. That's what we're seeking to do with the admission of both the certified copy of the 1998 armed robbery conviction and the 2006 felon in possession conviction as well, your Honor.

The Defendant makes an argument under 403, however, he is applying the wrong standard. 403 says that it's excludable only if the -- only if the relevant nature of the

evidence is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice.

In this case, your Honor, the Government has offered to stipulate, essentially stipulate away this evidence by allowing Mr. Morgan to agree that he is a felon, that he is a prohibited person. Mr. Morgan has decided not to do that.

Mr. Morgan has essentially forced us to prove up his knowledge that he has been -- that he has been convicted of a crime punishable by more than one year in prison.

And, in fact, Mr. Morgan is even contesting those convictions. So Mr. Morgan is not only forcing us to prove — to prove this issue, but he is contesting our proofs on this issue. That makes these documents of not one but both convictions extremely relevant, your Honor.

Again, Mr. Morgan, quite frankly, holds the keys to whether or not this evidence is admissible or not because we have offered to stipulate it away. Mr. Morgan has chosen not to do that, and that's fair, that's his right; however, at the same time, Mr. Morgan can't not agree to the stipulation and then contest the evidence we're going to put forth, but then limit us in the evidence we're going to put forth on this issue when it's a direct element based upon the recent Supreme Court cases.

USA v Morgan - 19-20259

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. VAN WERT: Thank you.

```
1
                          Do you have any response to that?
 2
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  No.
 3
               THE COURT: All right. The one element of the crime,
 4
      Mr. Morgan, is that you had been convicted of a felony
 5
      previously and that you knew that you were a convicted felon
 6
      at the time you allegedly possessed the firearm. And so in
 7
      order to prove that the Government has to show that you have
 8
      a prior felony conviction, which would be the armed robbery
 9
      conviction.
10
               And to prove that you knew that you had a prior
11
      felony conviction, the Government wants to show that you had
12
      previously been convicted of the same crime you're charged
13
      with here; that is, being a prohibited person in possession
14
      of a firearm. And so both of those are highly probative.
15
               Now, it is true that the jury could consider multiple
      felony convictions to show that you simply have a bad
16
17
      character or that you have a propensity to commit a crime.
18
      That is a danger. But it does not substantially outweigh the
      probative value. And so Rule 403, in my view, would not
19
20
      prohibit that evidence. And so your objection to Exhibits --
21
      to Exhibit 5 is overruled.
22
               I don't think we have any further motions; is that
23
      correct?
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
24
25
               THE COURT: All right. Ms. Raben, in light of my
```

```
1
      rulings, would you like a few minutes to talk to Mr. Morgan?
 2
               MS. RABEN:
                           Yes.
 3
               THE COURT: All right. We will take a recess. And
 4
      let me know when you're ready and then we will call for the
 5
      jury.
 6
               Recess court.
 7
               THE CLERK: All rise. Court is now in recess.
 8
         (Recess taken from 10:10 a.m. to 10:50 a.m.)
 9
10
11
         (Jury Voir Dire and Selection Held Under Separate Volume.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
All rise. Court is back in session.
 1
               THE CLERK:
 2
               THE COURT: You may be seated.
 3
               Are we ready for the jury?
 4
               MR. VAN WERT: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.
 5
               THE COURT: Mr. Morgan?
 6
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
 7
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 8
               Bring in the jury, please.
 9
               THE CLERK: All rise for the jury.
10
         (Jury entered courtroom at 1:03 p.m.)
11
               THE COURT: You may be seated.
12
               Members of the jury, when we began the selection
13
      process you took an oath to answer the questions truthfully.
14
      We have another oath to administer to you right now with
15
      respect to your function as jurors on this trial.
16
               So I'm going to ask if you will all please stand,
17
      raise your right hands, listen to Ms. Pinkowski's oath, and
      answer out loud when she has finished.
18
19
         (Jury sworn at 1:04 p.m.)
20
               THE COURT: Thank you. You may be seated.
21
               Members of the jury, I want to speak to you briefly
22
      about the function of a judge in a criminal trial and your
23
      function as jurors.
24
               You have just been sworn as a jury to try this case,
25
      and by your verdict you will decide the disputed issues of
```

fact that exist between the parties.

The Court, that is I, will decide questions of law that arise during the trial, and before you retire to deliberate at the conclusion of the trial I will give you instructions on the law that you are to follow in deciding the case and in reaching your verdict.

I do that verbally, but I also give them to you in writing so that each of you will have a copy of those written instructions at the end of the case.

It is my responsibility to conduct the trial of this case in an orderly, fair, and efficient manner, to rule upon the questions of law that arise during the course of the trial, and to instruct you on the law that you are to apply to the case.

You can look on my function, that is, the function of the Court, as that of a referee or an umpire. I have no personal or professional interest in how this case comes out. The outcome of the case will be entirely up to you as the jury in returning your verdict.

My job is to see to it that only legally admissible evidence is received in court, in this court, and to tell you what the law is during and at the end of the trial and to settle any disputes that might arise between the parties during the course of the trial.

Now, a few housekeeping matters. As I mentioned

before, the seats that you are in now are the seats that you will occupy whenever you're in the courtroom.

I see all of you are wearing your juror pages. It's very important that you keep those badges on and visible at all times when you're in the building and also during breaks, if there is an occasion for you to leave the building during the day. The reason is that there are several people in the building and in the vicinity of the courthouse who may be attorneys or witnesses, and they know that they should not have any contact with jurors. But you have to put them on notice that you are a juror and that's why you wear the badges. The badges also put the public on notice that you are jurors, so no one will try to talk to you about what you're doing or to discuss anything about the case.

I would like to also tell you something about the staff that's assigned to every federal judge, so you know what they are doing during the trial.

As I mentioned, Ms. Twedt is a certified court reporter and she takes down everything that is said in the court room by making the court record. It's a verbatim record, and she does that on a stenotype machine that is connected to a computer, but it also emits strips of paper that have court reporter's notes on them.

Now, the court reporter's notes are not normally legible by or readable by people that are untrained. It takes

quite a bit of skill to be able to read the notes. But if becomes necessary to determine what's been said, either an exact question or exact answer of a witness, Ms. Twedt can read that back with her court reporter notes. And if it becomes important later on to find out what happened during the entire trial, she can produce a transcript by using those notes.

Now, the technology is not available to produce an immediate, clear, and accurate transcript. We can produce rough transcripts pretty quickly. But sometimes jurors ask if they can have the transcript of the testimony of a witness when they are deliberating and that takes time.

We don't send transcripts back into the jury room.

If you have questions about what a witness says or said, then there is an opportunity to come back into the courtroom and have that testimony read back to you, but we don't like to do that because it's somewhat time consuming, although we can, if need be.

But the point is that you should pay attention to what the witnesses say and be attentive at the time that the testimony comes in so that we don't have to try to repeat that later on.

Also, you met Ms. Susan Pinkowski, our courtroom deputy clerk. She also holds the title of case manager. Now, her job is to see to it that the ongoing business of this

court goes forward even while I'm occupied by this trial.

Now, this is one of many cases that are on my list, which we call the docket, and those cases are in various stages of development, and Ms. Pinkowski monitors those and helps move them along through the process.

She will do that sometimes while she is in the courtroom. Sometimes she won't be in the courtroom, she will be back in her office. Other times she will come and go and may hand me papers to sign, which usually don't have anything to do with this case. And the only reason I bring it up is because it is part of the normal give and take and activity of the courtroom and it should not be a distraction for you to your primary job, which is to pay attention to the testimony of the witnesses.

In addition, I have two law clerks that are assigned to me. Michael Shaffer is our senior law clerk, who is giving his Thanksgiving Day parade wave to you over there, and Amir El-Aswad is our junior law clerk. He is sitting right over here.

When I say that they are law clerks, that's really somewhat of a misnomer. They are both attorneys. They have both taken and passed bar examinations. They stay with me for a finite period of time and their job is to assist me in doing legal research primarily.

When I instruct you on the law, I want to be sure

that it's accurate and current. And the law is in a state of flux; sometimes it changes daily. So one of their jobs is to assist me in making sure that the law that I give you is current, updated, and accurate.

They also are working on other cases and they may be coming and going and handing me papers to sign, and once again, that should not serve as a distraction for you.

Now, the building we are in was completed in 1933 at the end of the Hoover administration, beginning of the Roosevelt administration, for those of you who are fans of American presidents. Actually, if you have the opportunity after the trial is over to look around the building and see some of the architectural features, it really is quite a very impressive monument in the city here and take advantage of that.

One thing that you will notice is that we are in a construction phase, as well, which is a renovation within the building itself, and one of the things that the contractors have done is to redo all the plumbing, electrical, and HVAC systems.

Now, I saw some of you fanning yourselves a little earlier today, which means that it's either not working or working too well, so we will try to keep it a little cooler in here, especially in the afternoon hours. But if it gets too cool, attend to your own comfort. If you want to bring a

2.0

sweater so you can doff it or don it as your comfort dictates, feel free to do that.

The hours of court are 8:00 in the morning to 5:00 in the afternoon. We will conduct this trial during the hours of 8:30. We will begin tomorrow morning at 8:30. We will continue until about 3:00 or 3:30. We will not take a lunch break. We will take breaks during the day.

If you would like to snack during the breaks, feel free to bring something and keep it in the refrigerator in the jury room. If you need water it is in the refrigerator in the jury room as well and you can bring water into the courtroom if you like as well.

When we take our breaks we will try to time them for a logical break point, which means after a witness testifies or between the direct and cross examination of a witness.

Plan on arriving early, maybe ten after 8:00 or 8:15 to assemble on the fifth floor in the jury room so we can be -- have you up here and in the box in the courtroom by 8:30 so we can get moving on the case. The sooner we start, the sooner we finish.

If there is anything else that you need other than water or anything else, please let us know. For example, if you need to take a break to use the facilities or for any reason, just either raise your hand, or if I don't notice you or somebody doesn't notice you, speak up.

As happens from time to time, you get drowsy see and it's a little tough to pay attention and you want to just take a stretch break, just stand in place. You don't have to ask permission to do that.

If you need more than that and you need to just walk to clear your head, tell us. We will do that. This is not a marathon contest. The point is, we want to keep you attentive and fresh so that you can receive the evidence and make your decision based on it.

Now, you will notice we have thirteen of you. Twelve jurors are the requisite number to decide a criminal case. We have an extra juror that we call an alternate juror because we know that in the ordinary experiences of life people sometimes become sick or have accidents or emergencies and if that should happen we want to be sure that there is the legally required number of jurors to decide the case.

Now, none of you is identified right now as an alternate juror. We will make that choice at the conclusion of the case. And so all of you should pay attention, because potentially every one of you might be called upon, likely will be called upon to deliberate and decide the case.

Now, with respect to note taking, I see all of you or most of you, I think all of you, have brought your notebooks into the courtroom. You're not obliged to take notes. And if you do take notes you shouldn't be influenced by the notes of

another juror, but rather, you should rely on your own recollection of what the evidence is.

Also, don't let note taking distract you from paying attention to the testimony of the witnesses or looking at the exhibits as they are displayed. Notes are not evidence in the case. They are only an aid to recollection and they are not entitled to any greater weight than the actual recollection or impression of each juror as to what the testimony is.

Notes taken by a juror should not be disclosed to anyone other than a fellow juror during the deliberation process. The notebooks also must remain in the jury room at the conclusion of the day. Don't take them home with you.

At the conclusion of the trial you can take your notes with you, I mean, when the case is all over with, or you can leave them in your notebooks and we will destroy them. Nobody is going to read your notes. They will be private. I think the notebooks are probably identified by juror number, but if you like, write your name on the first page so that you can identify them.

Now, I want to explain briefly the general order of the procedures in a trial so that you know what's coming next.

The first thing that will happen when I'm done with these preliminary instructions is that the attorney for the Government will make an opening statement.

The purpose of the opening statement is for counsel

to outline to you the Government's theory of the case and what she thinks the evidence will show. Opening statements are not evidence. They are only intended to assist you in understanding the viewpoints of the parties.

At the conclusion of the Government's opening statement Mr. Morgan will have an opportunity to make an opening statement or he may elect to reserve it until later in the trial.

After opening statements we will begin taking the actual evidence. As I said, the statements of the attorneys are not evidence. Mr. Morgan's opening statement is not evidence in the case.

Evidence consists of the testimony of witnesses and exhibits, which can be documents or physical objects, that you can consider in deciding the case.

The testimony of witnesses is taken by the -- first of all, the Government calling a witness to come forward to testify. The witness is sworn to tell the truth, will take a seat over here in the witness box, and then evidence will proceed by question and answer.

The Government's attorney will ask the witnesses -the witness questions; the witness will respond. We call that
direct examination.

When the Government has asked all the questions it chooses to of the witness, then Mr. Morgan will have an

opportunity to question that witness. We call that cross examination. Cross examination is allowed because sometimes it illuminates the testimony or challenges the testimony or sometimes it might be useful to elicit testimony that could be favorable to the Defense.

After the direct and cross examination and sometimes redirect and recross examination the witness will be excused, the Government will call its next witness, and we will repeat the process until all the witnesses have testified, and at that point the Government will rest its case.

After the Government rests, then the Defendant has an opportunity to present evidence. Now, you should clearly understand that a defendant in a criminal case is not obliged to produce any evidence whatsoever. The law does not require a defendant in a criminal case to prove his innocence or produce any evidence.

Also, however, if the Defendant does call witnesses the attorney for the Government will have a right to cross examine the witnesses called by the Defendant.

After all the evidence has been presented I will give preliminary final instructions on the law that you are to apply in the case. As I said, I'll give them verbally in court and also in writing so you can follow along.

After I have given those preliminary instructions both sides will have an opportunity to present closing

arguments in support of their case. Those statements, the statements by the attorneys and the statements of Mr. Morgan during closing arguments, are not evidence, just like opening statements are not evidence. But they are only intended to assist you in understanding the evidence and the theory of each party. You must base your decision only on the evidence in the case.

Following the closing arguments of the attorneys and Mr. Morgan I will give you an instruction on the manner of your deliberations and the possible verdicts that you may return and then you will retire to the jury room and deliberate on your verdict. You will do that by applying the law as I give it to you to the facts as you find them to be.

The function of the jury is to determine the facts and you are the sole and exclusive judges of the facts and you alone will determine the weight, the effect, and the value of the evidence as well as the credibility of the witnesses. You must consider and weigh all of the testimony of each witness who appears before you and you alone are to determine whether to believe any witness and the extent to which you think any witness should be believed.

It is your responsibility to consider any conflicts in the testimony that might be presented by the witnesses or the evidence or that might arise during the course of the trial. Your decision as to any fact in the case is final.

2.0

On the other hand, it is your duty to accept the law as I give it to you and apply that law.

Your determination of the facts of the case must be based only on the evidence that is offered and received in this courtroom. As I said before, evidence consists of the testimony of the witnesses and the exhibits, which as I mentioned could be documents or other physical objects. It also may include some things that I simply instruct you to consider as evidence.

And as to evidence, the questions that the attorneys and Mr. Morgan ask the witnesses are not evidence themselves. It is the answers of the witnesses that consist of the evidence in the case.

Now, some of you may have heard the terms, direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence is simply evidence like the testimony of an eyewitness which, if you believe it, directly proves a fact.

So as an example, if a witness testified that he saw it raining outside and you believed that witness, that would be direct evidence that it was raining.

Circumstantial evidence is simply a chain of circumstances that indirectly prove a fact. If someone, for example, continuing our analogy, walked into the courtroom carrying a wet umbrella and wearing a raincoat that was covered with drops of water, that would be circumstantial

evidence from which you could conclude or infer that it was raining outside.

It is your job to decide how much weight to give the direct and circumstantial evidence. The law does not make any distinction between the two, nor does it say that one is any better evidence than the other. You should consider all the evidence, both direct and circumstantial, and give it whatever weight you believe it deserves.

Your function as the jury, of course, is equally important as the function of the Court and the attorneys and Mr. Morgan. You should give careful attention to the testimony as it is presented for your consideration. You should keep an open mind and not form or express any opinion about the case until after you have heard all of the evidence, the closing arguments of the attorneys and Mr. Morgan, and the instructions as to the law, and until you have retired to the jury room to consider your verdict.

From this point forward you must not discuss the case with anyone, not even members of your own family, and not even with each other as jurors in the case. It would be unfair for you to discuss the case among yourselves or with others like family and friends until you have heard all the evidence and retired to consider your verdict.

So you may tell your family and friends that you have been selected as a juror on this case, but then you must tell

them that you are under instructions from the Court not to discuss the case with them until I permit you to do so.

After the case is submitted to you for your deliberations you still must not discuss it with anyone else and only discuss it with each other when I instruct you to do so, and only in the jury room and only in the presence of all your fellow jurors.

When the trial is over and your verdict has been received in open court, then you may discuss the case with anyone you wish, but until that time comes we ask that you control the natural desire to discuss the case both here and at home.

The only information that you will receive about this case will come to you while you are all together as a jury in the presence of the Court and the attorneys and the parties involved. You must not consider any information that might come to you from outside the courtroom.

This trial, like all federal trials, is governed by rules that have to do with the admissibility of evidence. The rules include the Federal Rules of Evidence and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

The rules have been debated and established by

Congress and the United States Supreme Court over many years.

Many of the rules have to do with the reliability or

unreliability of certain evidence. Evidence that has been

determined to be unreliable may not be admissible and may not be considered by you.

In many cases I rule on the admissibility of the evidence before the trial even begins. So it is extremely important that you follow the instructions that you may only consider the evidence which is admitted in this courtroom. So you must not read any newspaper articles, if there are any, about this case, or relating to this trial. You must not watch or listen to any television or radio accounts or commentaries about the trial, if there are any during the trial while it is in progress. I find it unlikely that there will be coverage, but I say that as a matter of caution.

You must not visit any scene that is mentioned in the evidence in the case. If it should be necessary that you must visit a scene you will be taken there as a group under the supervision of the Court. That's unlikely to occur in this case as well.

You must not consider as evidence any personal knowledge that you might have about a place that's mentioned in the evidence. You may not make any investigation on your own or conduct any experiments of any kind.

I know that many of you use smartphones, tablets, the internet, and other tools of technology. I imagine it's ubiquitous, everybody seems to have one, but you must not use those to check anything out about this case.

2.0

I think the natural desire these days, it's almost a human reaction when something new comes up, one might want to Google the person or the event or the law or the evidence or the U.S. Attorneys or the Court. You can't do that. I mean, you can when it's done, but you can't do it now. So you really should go radio silent at this point until the case is finished.

So don't make any investigations on your own or conduct any experiments. You may not communicate electronically with anyone about the case. That includes your family and friends. You may not go on any social media sites or any blogs or other social networking websites. Don't post on Facebook or Snapchat or YouTube. All of these rules apply while the case is underway. As I said, after the case is over and your verdict has been received in open court, that all disappears, but until then, please honor that instruction.

You should not consult dictionaries or reference materials or search the internet or blogs or use any other electronic tools to obtain information about this case or to help you decide the case.

Don't try to find any information from any source outside the confines of this courtroom and don't permit anyone to communicate with you or accept any communications that are directed to you having anything whatsoever to do with this trial. If anyone does attempt to contact you about this case,

you must report it to me immediately, as soon as you return to the jury room.

The story that I always tell has to do with a case involving a colleague of mine, a District Judge in Missouri who started a criminal case, was into it for a couple of weeks, and it was a long trial, and one of the jurors ended up going on line and finding something about a witness or something like that. Anyway, he used the internet to discover information about the case.

And when that came to light, the Judge had to declare a mistrial, and of course, since the juror violated an order of the Court, the Judge had to find the juror in contempt.

And the penalty was the cost of having to try the case again, which can be pretty expensive. So I say that not as a threat or to intimidate you, but just so you understand that we have to take this seriously. And this is not going to be a long trial, and so it really shouldn't be that difficult to just isolate yourself for the next couple of days from those common features of technology that we like to use.

Now, a trial follows long-established rules of procedure and evidence and the attorneys are trained in those rules. Mr. Morgan has some knowledge of that and may consult with Ms. Raben about it. From time to time, the lawyers, therefore, based on those rules, may make objections to some of the questions that are asked or evidence that's being

offered. Now, I'll rule on those objections and motions and most of the time I will do that in your presence.

You should not conclude from any rulings that I have an opinion about the case or that I favor one side or the other. If I sustain an objection to a question and don't permit a witness to answer, you should not try to guess what the answer might have been or draw any inference from the question itself.

Now, sometimes the attorneys and parties are required by law to take up matters of objections outside of your hearing, and if that's the case, I will excuse you from the courtroom, you'll go back to the jury room, we will take that up on the record here, make my rulings, and then we will bring you back in.

Now, I'm not able to predict when that might happen, but one thing I'll pledge to you is that we will handle it expeditiously so you can get back into the courtroom, hear the testimony, and conclude the case.

Now, this is a criminal case. The indictment charges the Defendant with a crime, and I will summarize the charge against the Defendant. You heard it earlier today.

It says -- the indictment says that Gemar Morgan, referred to sometimes in this trial as the Defendant, committed a crime involving a firearm that took place in this District, that is, the Eastern District of Michigan, on

April 9 of 2019, and that on or about that date Mr. Morgan possessed a firearm when he was prohibited from doing so under law because he previously had been convicted of a felony.

Mr. Morgan pleaded not guilty to the indictment.

You should clearly understand that the indictment in this case is not evidence, but it serves only to inform Mr. Morgan of the charge against him. An indictment is presented in every criminal trial. You must not consider it as any evidence of guilt, nor draw any inference of guilt because Mr. Morgan has been charged.

Basic to our system of criminal justice is the principle that a person accused of a crime is presumed to be innocent. That presumption of innocence starts at the very beginning of the case and continues throughout the trial and during your deliberations.

Each and every one of you must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt after deliberating that the Defendant is guilty before you can return a verdict of guilty.

You must begin the trial with the presumption of innocence foremost in your mind. The fact that the Defendant was arrested and is on trial is not any evidence against him. There must be evidence introduced in this trial that convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant is guilty before you can convict the Defendant.

The law does not require a Defendant to prove his

innocence or produce any evidence whatsoever. The burden of proving guilt is upon the Government throughout the entire course of the trial and at no time does the burden ever shift to the Defendant.

The burden of proof means that every element of the offense charged must be proved by evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. A reasonable doubt is a doubt based on reason and common sense, the kind of the doubt that would make a reasonable person hesitate to act. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, must be proof of such a convincing character that a reasonable person would not hesitate to rely and act on it in the most important of his or her own affairs.

Now, I may give you additional instructions during the course of the trial, and as I said, I'll give you detailed instructions at the end of the trial. All of these instructions are important because together they state the law that you are to apply in deciding this case.

During the trial, as I mentioned, we will take certain recesses and sometimes during those recesses you will be permitted to separate, leave the jury room, and go about your personal affairs. During the recesses you must not discuss the case among yourselves or with anyone else, nor should you allow anyone to say anything to you or in your presence about the case. If anyone does try to say anything to you or in your presence about the case you should advise

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
them that you are on the jury hearing the case and ask them to
       If they do not, you must advise me upon your return to
the jury room.
         Now, we will begin in a moment. Let me know
immediately, please, by raising your hand or speaking up if
you cannot hear a witness or if you cannot see or hear what's
being demonstrated and we will try to correct that right away.
         We will now begin with the Government's opening
statement.
              Ison, is that your prerogative there?
                    It is, your Honor. Thank you.
         MS. ISON:
         THE COURT: Are you prepared to address the jury?
        MS. ISON:
                    I am, your Honor. Thank you.
         THE COURT: You may proceed.
         Actually, before you do, just take a stretch break.
Why don't we just all stand for a minute. I don't mean to say
that my instructions are boring, but they are boring.
   (Pause in the proceedings at 1:35 p.m.)
         THE COURT: All right. You may proceed.
                    This is simply a case about the facts;
         MS. ISON:
facts about Mr. Morgan's past, uncontested facts about his
convictions, and facts about more current events that bring
us here that you will hear from all of the law enforcement
witnesses in this case.
        As a matter of fact, Mr. Morgan was convicted of a
```

felony previously; that is, a crime punishable by imprisonment by more than one year, and in fact, he was convicted of two.

In 1999 Mr. Morgan was convicted of armed robbery.

He pleaded guilty to that offense, and he served approximately four-and-a-half years in prison.

In 2006 Mr. Morgan was convicted of the very crime he is charged with here today, and that is felon in possession of a firearm in the Western District of Michigan. He pleaded guilty to that offense and he served approximately six years for that.

As a matter of fact, as it relates to the more current facts in this case, Mr. Morgan, on -- I'm sorry -- on February 20th, 2009 -- 2019, a judge in Allen Park authorized a warrant for Mr. Morgan's arrest. At some point following the issuance of that warrant, the Allen Park Police contacted the Detroit Fugitive Apprehension Team and asked for their assistance in arresting Mr. Morgan.

That is a team of officers who is made up of local, state, and federal officers and that's what they do. They go out and search for people who have valid outstanding warrants, which is a fact that Mr. Morgan had.

Trooper -- Michigan State Trooper Brian Kross will tell you that they searched for Mr. Morgan, and on April 9th, 2019, they found him in Warren, Michigan, and they arrested him.

And as a matter of fact, he was in possession of a Raven Arms .25 caliber weapon in his front -- and it was concealed in his front pants pocket. That pistol was functional and had been manufactured in the state of California. And that is a fact that ATF Officer -- Special Agent -- I'm sorry -- David Salazar will tell you. In fact, the weapon itself indicates that the gun had been manufactured in the state of California.

When you hear all those facts from the witnesses in this case and you combine the facts from Mr. Morgan's past, along with the more current facts of what occurred on April 9 of 2019, you will be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Morgan was convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for more than one year; that following that conviction Mr. Morgan knowingly carried a firearm, the Raven Arms .25 caliber semi-automatic pistol; that at the time Mr. Morgan possessed that firearm he knew he had been previously convicted of a crime punishable by more than one year; and that the firearm was manufactured outside the state of Michigan, and therefore, crossed a state line before Mr. Morgan possessed it.

And after you hear the undisputed facts in this case that satisfy each and every element of the crime charged here, we will ask you to return a verdict of guilty against Mr. Morgan.

```
1
               Thank you, your Honor.
 2
               THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, would you like to make an
 3
      opening statement now or would you like to reserve it until
 4
      later on?
 5
                                 I would like to make one now.
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
 6
               THE COURT: Okay. You can stand right there. Pull
 7
      your microphone close. And you may make your opening
 8
      statement to the jury.
 9
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  The Federal Government alleges
10
      that I have committed a violation of 18 U.S.C. 922(g), felon
11
      in possession of a firearm.
12
               The Defense assert the Fourteenth Amendment of the
13
      United States Constitution: No state shall make any law that
14
      will abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the
15
      United States, nor shall any state deprive any person of life,
16
      liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny any
17
      person the equal protection of the laws.
18
               The definition of felon is one who has been convicted
19
      of a felony and has not yet finished serving time for a
2.0
      conviction.
21
               MS. ISON: Objection, your Honor.
22
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I was not convicted --
23
               THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, excuse me.
                                                   There is an
24
      objection. When there is an objection, you have to stop and
25
      let me rule on it.
```

```
1
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                 Okay.
 2
               THE COURT: What's the objection, Ms.
 3
                          Your Honor, Mr. Morgan is giving a
               MS. ISON:
 4
      definition of felon that the Court has already ruled is an
 5
      incorrect definition.
 6
               THE COURT: Right. Mr. Morgan, do you remember when
 7
      we dealt with this a little bit earlier, I told you that you
 8
      should not be giving statements of the law, that the law comes
 9
      from me?
10
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: All right.
12
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: This is the definition I got out
13
      the law library and a dictionary.
               THE COURT: I know. But that's not a definition that
14
15
      you can give the jury. The jury will be instructed by me
16
      as to what the law is and, in fact, your definition is not
17
      correct. So move on with respect to your opening statement on
18
      the facts.
19
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: That's the only thing -- that's
20
      the only definition the dictionary have for a felon.
21
               THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to argue with you.
22
      I'm going to tell you to move on.
23
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I was not convicted of any crime
24
      on April 9, 2019, and was not serving any sentence, which the
25
      law state, no state should deprive a person of life, liberty,
```

```
or property, as the title, felon, has deprived in this matter.
 2
               The Tenth Amendment, the power is not delegated to
 3
      the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to
 4
      the states or by -- or are reserved to the states respectfully
 5
      or to the people.
 6
               This is a form of entrapment etched by Government
 7
      officials of inducing a crime that has not been committed nor
      were contemplated without the Government inducement of
 8
 9
      obstruction of justice as defined in the Michigan Compiled
10
      Laws, 750.224f.
11
               MS. ISON: Objection, your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, you're talking about the law
13
      again.
             That's not your prerogative.
14
                                  I'm just giving the definition of
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
15
      the Michigan Compiled Laws, felon in possession.
16
               THE COURT: I'm very aware of what you're doing, and
17
      I told you, you can't do it.
18
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: It asserts my right that I wasn't
19
      a felon in possession up under the Michigan state law.
20
               THE COURT: Well, the law is the --
21
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: It's the definition of it.
22
               THE COURT: -- enactments of Congress that I will
23
      instruct the jury on. That's not your prerogative.
24
               Do you have any arguments -- or rather -- opening
25
      statement about what the facts will show or what the evidence
```

```
will prove?
 1
 2
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: It's the definition of Michigan
 3
      state law. I was a resident of Michigan.
 4
               THE COURT: You're not hearing me, Mr. Morgan. You
 5
     don't have the right to give the jury a definition of state
 6
      law.
 7
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: What's the purpose of the opening
 8
     statement?
 9
               THE COURT: The opening statement is to show -- is to
10
     tell the jury what the facts -- what you believe the facts
11
     will show and what your theory of the case is.
12
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Well, the Fourteenth Amendment say
13
      I have equal protection of the law. I should be able to
14
     assert this. It defines exactly what a felon in possession in
15
      the state of Michigan amounts to.
16
               THE COURT: This is a federal crime, Mr. Morgan --
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I understand.
17
18
               THE COURT: -- that you're accused of.
19
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I understand. I live in the state
20
     of Michigan. I don't live on any tribal or reservation. I
21
     wasn't a federal person. I was in the state of Michigan.
               THE COURT: Do you have any further opening statement
22
23
     for the jury relating to the facts of the case?
24
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes. Yes.
25
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
```

```
1
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Okay. So you saying I can't
      assert Michigan Compiled Law 750?
 2
 3
               THE COURT: That's correct.
 4
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Okay.
 5
               Also, the prosecutor and the police involved in this
 6
      matter has cleverly, with the intention of fraudulent acts,
 7
      conspired to defraud Mr. Morgan of the rights that the
 8
      Constitution was designed to protect the citizens of the state
 9
      of Michigan, as the Tenth Amendment declared the power to the
10
      state and to the people.
11
               On April 9, 2019, I was being in recovery of a
12
      semi-truck accident that happened in Brazil, Indiana. As a
13
      result of the insurance Company for the trucking Company I
14
      worked for, somehow the insurance Company committed a list
15
      of fraudulent acts to prevent from rendering the benefits that
      I was awarded. As you will see, the insurance Company has
16
17
      successfully created a falsehood whereas I have to prove my
18
      innocence that I was not a felon as the term is defined in the
19
      dictionary.
20
               The prosecutor and polices of various departments are
21
      fraudulent trying to force the term, felon, under a character
22
      I never represented. God blessed me to be a provider and a
23
      protector, which is the characteristics I will live by and
24
      die by.
25
               All across the United States I am known as a provider
```

```
and a protector. My service as a commercial truck driver has
 2
      contributed to the economic boom that Michigan and the
 3
      surrounding states has taken into effect.
 4
               Due to the fact I have put -- I put being a provider
 5
      and a protector first in all elements of life, if I die today
 6
      I thank God for allowing me the life to provide and protect.
 7
               I do not break laws and I refuse to accept the label
 8
      of being something I will never be, which is a felon. Without
 9
      a doubt, God will provide the final answer to the best decision
10
      in this matter. In God we trust.
11
               THE COURT:
                          Thank you, Mr. Morgan.
12
               The Government may call its first witness.
13
               Mr. Van Wert, is that yours?
14
               MR. VAN WERT: The Government calls Trooper Brian
15
      Kross.
16
               THE COURT:
                          Is Mr. Kross in the courtroom?
17
               MR. VAN WERT: No. He is in the hallway, your Honor.
18
               May I move the lectern, your Honor?
19
               THE COURT: No. My clerk will do that.
2.0
               Are you Brian Kross?
21
               THE CLERK: Yes, your Honor.
22
               THE COURT:
                          Would you step up here, please?
23
      right over there. Raise your right hand and be sworn.
24
         (Witness sworn at 1:46 p.m.)
25
               THE COURT: Would you have a seat right over here in
```

```
the witness box?
 2
               Mr. Kross, would you adjust the microphone so you can
 3
      speak into the tip of it? The chair is not going to move, but
 4
      you might be able to pull the microphone closer.
 5
               THE COURT:
                          Okay. Is that better?
 6
               THE COURT: I think so. State your full name and
 7
      spell your last name for the jury.
 8
               THE WITNESS: Brian Kross, K-r-o-s-s.
 9
               THE COURT: All right. Stand by, counsel.
10
               MR. VAN WERT: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.
11
               May I proceed, your Honor?
12
               THE COURT: No.
13
               All right, Mr. Van Wert, you may proceed.
14
                              Thank you, your Honor.
               MR. VAN WERT:
15
16
                                 BRIAN KROSS
17
                   was called as a witness, after having
18
                  been duly sworn to testify to the truth.
19
2.0
                            DIRECT EXAMINATION
21
     BY MR. VAN WERT:
22
          Good afternoon, Trooper Kross. Can you tell us where
23
     you're employed?
24
          I'm employed with the Michigan State Police.
25
          In what capacity?
```

- A. Currently serving as a sergeant.
- 2 Q. How long have you been a trooper with the Michigan State
- 3 Police?
- 4 A. Just under seven years.
- 5 Q. What is your current assignment?
- 6 A. I run the Motorcycle Division for the State Police.
- 7 \ Q. In what area of the state?
- 8 A. Metro Detroit.
- 9 Q. And what are your current duties in that assignment?
- 10 A. My current duties differ from what my assignment was at
- 11 the time of this incident.
- 12 Q. Sure.
- 13 A. My current duties, I supervise twelve other motorcyclists
- 14  $\parallel$  in the State of Michigan, general road patrols. And then we
- 15 | have different duties that fall under escorts, movements of
- 16 dignitaries, that sort of thing.
- 17 Q. So you indicated that you have been with the Michigan
- 18 State Police for seven years. Do you have any experience with
- 19 other law enforcement agencies?
- 20 **A.** I do not.
- 21  $\parallel$  Q. Take you back to April 9 of this year. Were you still
- 22 memployed with the Michigan State Police on that day?
- 23 **A.** I was, yes.
- 24 Q. What was your assignment in April 2019?
- 25  $\blacksquare$  A. During that time I was serving as a task force officer.

- 1 It's a multi-jurisdictional task force through the
- 2 U.S. Marshals, serving as a Special Deputy U.S. Marshal. Our
- 3 | job at that time was just to track, locate, and arrest violent
- 4 felony offenders.
- Q. When you say it's a multi-jurisdictional task force, what
- 6 does that mean?
- 7 A. Just a fancy word for -- it's law enforcement people from
- 8 different jurisdictions, State, DPD, Wayne County, local PDs,
- 9 and then also U.S. Marshals. So just a lot of different police
- 10 officers from each -- each place.
- 11 Q. Was there a name for that task force?
- 12 A. Yeah. It was just short for DFAT, Detroit Fugitive
- 13 Apprehension Team.
- 14 Q. Okay. Now, in April 2019 how large was the team that you
- 15 were assigned to?
- 16  $\parallel$  A. The team that I was assigned to consisted of six people.
- 17  $\parallel$  Q. And how long were you a task force officer with the
- 18 | fugitive apprehension team?
- 19 A. About 13 months.
- 20 Q. Now, as a task force officer with that fugitive team, how
- 21 were you given assignments?
- 22 A. Our assignments came from a couple different areas. We
- 23 have what's called LEIN, just stands -- an acronym that stands
- 24 for Law Enforcement Information Network. In the most simplest
- 25 terms, it's just how one police agency will talk to a different

police agency nationwide.

So we can search for felony warrants within an area that we work, in this case, Detroit, or requests can come in from an outside agency, can come in from State Police. I can have someone that I work with ask for help to locate someone. It can be a local PD. Anyone can ask. If there is a felony warranty out there, they can just say, we need help finding this person, and that was my job.

- Q. So in early 2019 were you asked to locate someone named Gemar Kinte Morgan?
- 11 A. I was.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- 12 Q. And how were you given that request or that assignment?
- A. That request came in from a person that I worked with
  within the department. At the time I was a trooper, so that
  name was forwarded to my current supervisor on that team, who
  basically just says, yes, we have time to go after him, or we
- have to wait until we free up some time.
- Q. Can you tell us why you were instructed to look for Gemar Morgan?
- A. I was instructed at that time he had a felony warrant for his arrest.
- 22 Q. That was out of Allen Park; correct?
- 23 A. Correct.
- Q. Is it fair to say that warrant was issued in February of 2019?

- 1 lacksquare A. Yes. It was earlier that year.
- Q. Okay. When you first received the assignment to locate
- 3 Gemar Morgan, what did you first do?
- 4 A. What I would do is just, A, confirm the warrant. So we
- 5  $\parallel$  would look it up in LEIN. We would run that person for a
- 6 warrant. And it is very simple, they either have a warrant or
- 7 | they don't. In this case I did validate that there was an
- 8 active felony warrant for his arrest.
- 9 Q. Okay. And did you also obtain a basic profile of Gemar
- 10 Morgan?
- 11 A. Yeah. Very basic. It's just an investigative tool. We
- 12 | have different law enforcement computer programs that can kind
- of help generate addresses, possible vehicles, all from prior
- 14 police contact from where he may have had his license
- 15 registered or his address or where a vehicle might be
- 16 registered to. So we just try to connect the dots in terms
- 17 of tracking someone. We read the reports from prior law
- 18 | enforcement contacts just to try to get an understanding of the
- 19 individual we're searching for.
- 20 Q. As part of that did you obtain a photograph of Gemar
- 21 Morgan?
- 22 A. I did.
- 23 Q. Did you also obtain his birthday?
- 24 A. I did.
- 25 Q. Was that July 11 of 1977?

```
I -- honestly, I don't remember.
     Α.
 2
          Would that be indicated in your police report?
     Q.
 3
          It would be in my police report, yes.
     Α.
 4
          You did author a police report in this matter; correct?
     Q.
 5
          I did, yes.
          Would looking at that refresh your memory?
 6
 7
     Α.
        It would.
 8
               MR. VAN WERT: Your Honor, may I approach the witness
 9
     briefly?
10
               THE COURT: Why?
11
               MR. VAN WERT: To refresh his memory with his police
12
      report. He indicated that he was made aware of Mr. Morgan's
13
      birthday.
14
               THE COURT: What does that have to do with anything
15
      in this case?
16
               MR. VAN WERT: Just for identification purposes,
17
      your Honor.
18
               THE COURT:
                          Mr. Morgan is in the courtroom. Maybe he
19
      can identify him.
20
               MR. VAN WERT: Absolutely. I can move on, if the
21
      Court wishes.
22
               THE COURT: Please do.
23
               MR. VAN WERT:
                              Thank you, your Honor.
24
     BY MR. VAN WERT:
```

Now, Trooper Kross, did you eventually locate and arrest

- 1 Mr. Morgan on that warrant?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. How much time approximately passed from the time you
- 4 received the assignment until when you arrested Mr. Morgan?
- 5 A. A month maybe.
- 6 Q. Let me take you back to April 9 of 2019. Again, you were
- 7 working that day as a task force officer with the fugitive
- 8 | team; correct?
- 9 A. That's correct.
- 10 Q. And were you also working that day with the other five
- 11 members of your team?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- 13 Q. And what did you do to attempt to locate Mr. Morgan that
- 14 | day? Where did you go?
- 15  $\parallel$  A. Our investigation led us to a physical therapy place on
- 16  $\parallel$  Hoover near Thirteen Mile. Our investigation led us there.
- 17 We established surveillance on the physical therapy building.
- 18  $\parallel$  And at that point, because I was the -- deemed the officer in
- 19 charge of our team, I established what we call an eye on the
- 20 | building. That's the person who is kind of directing the
- 21 | traffic within our own team. I had an eye on the main entrance
- 22 to this physical therapy place.
- 23 Q. Let me take you back one step.
- 24 So you indicated this building was located on Hoover;
- 25 correct?

- A. That's correct.
- 2 | Q. Near Thirteen Mile?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. What city was that located in?
- 5 A. I think it's Warren there.
- 6 Q. Is that located within the Eastern District of Michigan?
- 7  $\blacksquare$  A. It is, yes.
- Q. So you indicated that you had an eye on one portion of the
- 9 | building. What part of the building was that?
- 10 A. It was actually the rear of the building, but it would be
- 11 the main door to this -- to this physical therapy place.
- 12 Q. Okay. What type of clothing were you wearing that day?
- 13 A. I wear plain clothes. We move both the city and unmarked
- 14 | vehicles that are equipped with lights. If we are ever outside
- 15 of our vehicle we have a vest that we put on that has police
- 16 | identifications and markings.
- 17  $\parallel$  Q. Okay. So you indicated that you were at the rear of the
- 18 building, watching the building. Where were the other members
- 19 of your team?
- 20 A. At that time we established a perimeter on the building.
- 21  $\parallel$  I had two other people in the parking lot. It was a large
- 22 parking lot in the back. Two other task force officers were
- 23 with me to my far right and far left. The other three task
- 24 force officers were on the other side of the building, which
- 25 would be facing Hoover Road, just keeping an eye on the front

- l door.
- Q. Sure. So you indicated that at some point in time did
- 3 you, in fact, observe Gemar Morgan?
- 4 A. Yeah. I was the only one with a clear visual to the glass
- 5 door that was the physical therapy place. And at some point I
- 6 did observe Mr. Morgan come to that door. He did not exit at
- 7 | that time, but I was able to positively identify him based on
- 8 that contact and then also pictures that we had pulled up in
- 9 the past of him.
- 10 | Q. How long had you been there before you first observed
- 11 Mr. Morgan?
- 12 A. No more than an hour.
- 13 Q. Okay. When you first saw Mr. Morgan through that glass
- 14 door, what did you do next?
- 15 ■ A. I told my team that -- just to suit up, which means we put
- on our vests that carry those markings, and that I did, in
- 17 | fact, see our suspect.
- 18 Q. Okay. Now, after you were suited up, which means you put
- 19 your vest on with the police markings on it, what happened
- 20 next?
- 21 A. We waited. It was very shortly after that Mr. Morgan did
- 22 exit the physical therapy place.
- 23 Q. Okay. The person you talk about as -- you referred to as
- 24 Mr. Morgan, do you see him in court today?
- 25 A. I do.

```
Q. Can you please point to him and tell me what color clothing he is wearing?
```

- A. The gentleman over here wearing a black button-down shirt.
- MR. VAN WERT: Your Honor, the record reflect the identification of the Defendant Gemar Morgan.

6 THE COURT: Move on.

MR. VAN WERT: Thank you, your Honor.

## 8 BY MR. VAN WERT:

3

4

5

7

- Q. So you indicated you saw the Defendant exit the building.
- 10 How did you respond to that?
- 11 A. At that point all of our cars are equipped with radios.
- 12 We talk amongst our team members. And so I did let the team
- 13 know that he did exit the building and that we were going to be
- 14  $\parallel$  moving. That just means that we were in our vehicles. Myself
- 15 | and the two other task force officers that were in the parking
- 16  $\parallel$  lot, we drove our cars towards that main entrance to the
- 17 | physical therapy building to kind of box in our suspect.
- 18 Q. Okay. Did you then exit your vehicle?
- 19 A. We did.
- 20 Q. And what happened?
- 21 A. All three of us.
- We approached Mr. Morgan. Immediately -- because of the active felony warrant, immediately went hands on with him.
- Q. When you say you "went hands on with him," what do you
- 25 mean by that?

- A. We grab hold of him so he couldn't run away, couldn't get away.
  - Q. Okay. Were any restraints placed on Mr. Morgan?
- 4 A. A pair of handcuffs were.

16

- 5 Q. And who put the handcuffs on the Defendant?
- A. That would be a task force officer who works for the
  Detroit Police Department, Darren Long.
- Q. Okay. How was Mr. -- how was the Defendant acting when you first went, as you say, hands on with him?
- A. You know, I think our initial approach, by the time -you're talking about a matter of seconds by the time we jumped
  out of our vehicles. We all had our own vehicle. Walked up
  and grabbed him and put cuffs on him. I think the initial part
  was just more shock. Okay? So it wouldn't -- I would call it
  textbook. There was no issue, really. Just walked up and
- Q. Sure. When you saw the Defendant walk out of the building, did he appear to have any visible ailments as you saw him walk out of the building?
- 20 A. None whatsoever.

grabbed him and put handcuffs on.

- Q. So what happened after Officer Long put handcuffs on the Defendant?
- A. Officer Long did put handcuffs on the suspect. At that
  point it's policy that we would search him. I conducted a
  search, and where I located a handgun in his front-right pants

- l pocket.
- 2 Q. Okay. You say it's department policy in that situation.
- 3 Is that because you were arresting the Defendant on the
- 4 warrant?
- 5 A. Yeah. He has an active felony warrant and he is going to
- 6 | jail, so.
- 7 Q. Okay. You indicated that you found a gun in his pocket.
- 8 | How did you locate that?
- 9 A. As Officer Long had the suspect handcuffed, I would just
- 10 | start a search with my hands. And there was a handgun in his
- 11 | front-right pants pocket. Just check the pockets, empty his
- 12 pockets. We will pat down any area that -- just to, you know,
- 13 ensure that there is nothing else there.
- 14 ■ O. Okay. What did you do when you located that gun?
- 15 A. Immediately upon locating it, it was a small -- small
- 16 | handgun and it was inside a sock. So when I grabbed and pulled
- 17 | it out, I just confirmed, hey, it's a gun. But as soon as it's
- 18 | a gun, I left Mr. Morgan. I would go make the gun safe. I
- 19 believe I walked over to the hood of my vehicle just to make
- 20 the gun -- render it safe.
- 21  $\parallel$  Q. When you say you rendered it safe, what did you have to do
- 22 | for that?
- 23 A. I would eject the magazine and then you can rack the gun
- 24 | just to eject any caliber -- any round that is in the chamber.
- 25  $\parallel$  I observed a loaded magazine and also one in the chamber.

- Q. Okay. After you made it safe by ejecting the magazine and ejecting that round, was the gun capable of being fired anymore at that point in time?
- 4 A. I mean, if you loaded it again, but it was -- it was safe.
- 5 It was unloaded.
- Q. Sure. If you saw that firearm again, would you recognize it?
- 8 A. Absolutely.
- 9 MR. VAN WERT: Your Honor, may I approach the witness
  10 with Exhibit 1?
- 11 THE COURT: Yes. Proposed Exhibit 1.
- MR. VAN WERT: Proposed Exhibit 1. I apologize, your
- 13 Honor. Thank you.
- 14 BY MR. VAN WERT:
- Q. Trooper Kross, I'm showing you what's marked as Proposed
  Government Exhibit Number 1.
- 17 Do you recognize this item?
- 18 A. That's the firearm. Yes.
- Q. First of all, before you address it, has this firearm currently been rendered safe?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. How so?
- A. Well, it's rendered safe because there is a zip tie that's going through the magazine well and the chamber of the gun, so
- 25 you couldn't put a round in there.

```
Okay. So can you pick up Exhibit 1?
 2
               And this is the firearm that you recovered from
     Mr. Morgan on April 9, 2019; correct?
 3
 4
     Α.
          That's correct.
 5
               MR. VAN WERT: Your Honor, I move to admit Proposed
 6
      Exhibit 1.
 7
               THE COURT: Is the exhibit tag on the firearm or on
 8
      the box?
 9
               MR. VAN WERT: It's on the box, your Honor.
10
               THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Morgan, to Exhibit 1?
11
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  No.
12
               THE COURT: All right. Exhibit 1 is received.
13
         (Received in Evidence: Exhibit Number 1.)
14
     BY MR. VAN WERT:
15
          Trooper Kross, can you tell us, is there a serial number
16
     on that firearm?
17
        Yes, there is.
     Α.
18
          And where is that serial number located?
19
          On this particular handgun it's on the back strap of the
20
     gun, the rear part of the gun.
21
          And what is that serial number?
22
     Α.
          1096384.
23
          Can you tell us the caliber of that firearm?
     Q.
24
     Α.
          It's a .25 caliber.
25
          And what's the make of that firearm?
```

- l 📗 A. Raven. Raven Arms.
- 2 Q. I want to step back briefly. So when you first -- when
- 3 the Defendant was placed in handcuffs and you located the
- 4 | firearm in his pocket --
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. -- how did he respond? How did the Defendant respond?
- 7 A. As I walked away, I mean, you're talking a matter of
- 8 seconds, he responded, all of a sudden just flopped, just
- 9 dropped to the ground complaining of back pain, so.
- 10 Q. Okay. Can you describe how he was acting from that point
- 11 | forward?
- 12 A. That, that point forward I think until probably after --
- 13 this is fast-forwarding until after we left the hospital, just
- 14 | very belligerent, very -- just kind of out of control, very
- 15 | loud, very aggressive.
- 16  $\parallel$  Q. So you indicated that after you located the firearm you
- 17 | walked away from the Defendant; correct?
- 18 A. Correct. At that point my primary goal, the Defendant was
- 19 in custody and I wanted to make the firearm safe.
- 20 Q. Did other officers remain with him?
- 21 A. Always.
- 22 Q. Based upon how the Defendant began acting, was a decision
- 23 made to call for any type of assistance?
- 24 A. There was. He requested -- he demanded an ambulance. And
- 25 | it's with our policy, too, we won't be able to lodge someone

- 1 who is complaining of an injury, so it's within policy and
- 2 within his request that we called an ambulance to the scene.
- 3 Q. Okay. How close from your current location was the
- 4 nearest hospital?
- 5 A. Literally right across the street.
- 6 Q. Okay. So did you -- somebody from your team, in fact,
- 7 call for an ambulance?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And did it respond?
- 10 A. Immediately.
- 11 Q. How long did it take?
- 12 A. Less than five minutes.
- 13 Q. Okay. When the paramedics responded and the ambulance
- 14 responded to the scene, did they render some form of aid to
- 15 Mr. Morgan?
- 16 A. They did. He was transported to the hospital.
- 17 | Q. Okay. Did anybody from your team ride with him to the
- 18 | hospital?
- 19 A. I did.
- 20 Q. Okay. What happened when you got to the hospital with
- 21 Mr. Morgan?
- 22 A. We got to the hospital with Mr. Morgan. He was
- 23 transported by the medics inside. I may get the term -- to the
- 24 | triage room, I think, to get checked in.
- 25 Q. Okay. And did you remain with him through that process?

- A. I was with him through the entire process.
- 2 Q. Where -- did the Defendant go somewhere else after the
- 3 triage room?
- 4 | A. He was admitted to his own -- his own room, his own
- 5 private room.
- 6 Q. And did you go with him there?
- 7 **|** A. I did.
- 8 Q. How long was the Defendant at the hospital for that day?
- 9 A. I would estimate between an hour, hour and a half.
- 10  $\parallel$  Q. And what happened at the end of that hour and a half?
- 11 A. At the end of the hour and a half he was ultimately
- 12 granted his medical clearance, which gave me permission to
- 13 transport him to Allen Park PD, where the felony warranty was
- 14 | out of.
- 15  $\parallel$  Q. How was he transported there to Allen Park?
- 16 A. My department carries a policy, you're transported in the
- 17 | front seat, so he was walked to the front of my vehicle and
- 18 positioned in the front seat to the point that he was
- 19 comfortable and buckled in and I drove him.
- 20 | Q. So you drove the Defendant to Allen Park Police
- 21 Department; correct?
- 22 A. That's correct.
- 23 Q. And was he then handed over to the custody of Allen Park?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. The firearm, Exhibit Number 1 that you located in the

```
Defendant's pocket, was that secured as evidence?
 2
     Α.
          Yes.
 3
          What was done with that firearm that day?
 4
          Mr. Morgan was -- he was -- he was my case. He was the
     Α.
 5
     person that was assigned to me. And as I recovered the
 6
     vehicle -- or the vehicle -- the firearm, it's my
 7
     responsibility to log that into property under our department.
 8
     So that property, this firearm was entered into a temporary
 9
     property locker at our State Police headquarters here in
10
     Detroit.
11
          Was the ammunition also secured as evidence as well?
12
     Α.
          It was.
13
               MR. VAN WERT: Nothing further, your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, do you have any questions for
15
      the witness?
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
16
                                         Yes.
17
                             CROSS EXAMINATION
18
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
19
          Do you claim to be employed by an entity of the Government
20
     that does professional work?
21
          I'm sorry, does professional work?
22
     Q.
          Yes.
23
                 Yes.
     Α.
          Yeah.
24
                 Where was the location of the place when you first
```

had physical contact with Mr. Morgan?

```
I'm sorry, where was the first place I had contact with
 2
     you?
 3
          Physical contact.
     Q.
 4
          Physical contact would be the physical therapy place.
     Α.
 5
                Do you allege that the firearm traveled in
 6
     interstate commerce?
 7
               MR. VAN WERT: Objection, your Honor. I don't
     believe this witness has the qualifications for that.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Well, either the witness can answer or
10
      he can't.
11
               MR. VAN WERT: Absolutely.
12
               THE COURT: The objection is overruled.
13
               Can you answer the question?
14
               THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question? Did it
15
      travel in interstate commerce?
16
               THE COURT: No. I think the question was --
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
17
18
          No, I said, do you allege --
19
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Mr. Morgan, excuse me.
20
               I think the question was, "Do you allege that the
21
      firearm traveled in interstate commerce?"
22
               Was that your question?
23
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
24
               THE COURT: All right.
25
               THE WITNESS: If I'm understanding that question
```

```
correct, yes, it did.
 2
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
 3
          Okay. Is it possible that you have never made a mistake
 4
     in life?
 5
          Is it possible I never made a mistake?
 6
               MR. VAN WERT: Objection, your Honor, as to
 7
      relevance.
 8
               THE COURT: Overruled.
 9
                             Thank you, your Honor.
               MR. VAN WERT:
10
               THE WITNESS: I'm sure I've made a mistake in my life
11
      before.
12
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
13
        Okay. Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulation 373.100
14
     and 373.101 require all interstate commerce transactions to
15
     have a bill of lading.
16
               MR. VAN WERT: Objection, your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: Finish the question.
18
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
19
          Do you understand the purpose of a bill of lading?
20
               MR. VAN WERT: Objection. First, irrelevant.
21
               Second of all, this Defendant is again trying to put
22
      forth --
23
               THE COURT:
                           The objection is relevance?
24
               MR. VAN WERT: Yes, your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
```

```
1
               MR. VAN WERT:
                              Thank you, your Honor.
 2
               THE COURT:
                          Move on.
 3
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
        According to a bill of lading, can you please state the
 4
 5
     Company name and US DOT number that traveled in the interstate
 6
     commerce transaction that you allege?
 7
               MR. VAN WERT: Objection again as to relevance, your
 8
      Honor.
 9
               THE COURT: What's the purpose of the question?
10
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Oh, because in all interstate --
11
      according to the Code of Title 49, Code of Federal Regulation,
12
      373.101 and 373.100, in all interstate commerce transactions
13
      there must be a bill of lading.
14
               THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure that that's accurate,
15
      but whether there is a bill of lading or not with respect to
16
      this firearm really has nothing to do with this case,
17
      Mr. Morgan. So that objection is sustained.
18
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Well, he --
19
               THE COURT: Ask another question.
20
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: He alleged that the firearm
21
      traveled --
22
               THE COURT:
                          Don't argue with me, Mr. Morgan.
23
      another question.
24
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                 Okay.
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
25
```

- 1 lacksquare Q. What was the date of your first time communicating with
- 2 Mr. Morgan?
- 3 A. You called me, I think, on my work phone maybe two weeks
- 4 prior.
- 5  $\mathbb{Q}$ . That was March the 8th, 2019?
- 6 A. I'm not certain. You called me.
- 7 | Q. Did you ever go to Mr. Morgan's grandmother home?
- 8 A. There was a house that I went to. Correct.
- 9 Q. Okay. Do you know the definition of entrapment?
- 10 A. I mean, I don't know if I can restate it for you right
- 11 now.
- 12 Q. Excuse me?
- 13 A. You want me to give you the definition of entrapment?
- 14 Q. Yeah. If you know it.
- 15 A. I don't have a definition to give you right now.
- 16  $\parallel$  Q. Okay. Have you ever lied under oath to cover up the
- 17 truth?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. According to April the 9th, 2019, where did you take
- 20 Mr. Morgan?
- 21 A. Where -- where did I take you? I took you to Allen Park
- 22 Police Department.
- 23 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with Title 49 CFR, subsection
- 24 | 373.100 and 373.101, subpart (a), note a carrier receipt of
- 25  $\parallel$  bill of lading for all interstate commerce transactions?

- 1  $\blacksquare$  A. I am not familiar with that.
- Q. Okay. On April 9th, 2019, why did you put Mr. Morgan's
- 3 enhanced CDL in your pocket after you released Mr. Morgan and
- 4 his property to the Allen Park --
- 5 A. I'm sorry, can you restate that question, please?
- 6 Q. On April the 9th, 2019, why did you put Mr. Morgan's
- 7 enhanced CDL in your pocket after you released Mr. Morgan and
- 8 | his property to Allen Park Police Department?
- 9 A. Why I put your CDL -- are you talking about a driver's
- 10 | license?
- 11 Q. Yeah. You took my license with you.
- 12 A. Okay.
- 13 | Q. I say, why?
- 14 A. Why did I -- I take your license to identify you, and then
- 15 your property, which is the firearm.
- 16 Q. Okay. Do you still -- hold on.
- Do you still have Mr. Morgan's CDL and passport in
- 18 your possession?
- 19 A. I do not have your C -- I don't have your driver's license
- 20 or a passport, no, sir.
- 21 Q. What did you do with it?
- 22 A. I'm not sure. Are you alleging I still have your
- 23 property?
- 24 Q. I never received it.
- 25 THE COURT: What's your question, Mr. Morgan?

```
DEFENDANT MORGAN: I asked him, what did he do with
 1
 2
      my CDL.
 3
               THE COURT: Did you confiscate some property at the
 4
      time of the arrest?
 5
               THE WITNESS: The only property that I confiscated
 6
      was the firearm and a loaded magazine.
 7
               THE COURT: Did you confiscate a driver's license?
               THE WITNESS: No. Nothing was booked into property.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: All right. Did you do the booking?
10
               THE WITNESS: I'm sorry?
11
               THE COURT: Did you do the booking after you
12
      transported him to Allen Park?
13
               THE WITNESS: Yeah, I dropped him off at Allen Park
14
      and then he is out of my --
15
               THE COURT: Listen to the question.
16
               Did you conduct the booking?
17
               THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. No, I did not conduct the
18
      booking.
19
               THE COURT: All right.
20
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
21
          Did you ever take my license with you when you left
22
     Allen Park Police Department?
23
          That doesn't sound accurate, no.
24
          Okay. Do you allege that Mr. Morgan was serving any
25
     condition of a sentence on April 9th, 2019?
```

```
A. Can you repeat that, please?
```

- Q. Do you allege that Mr. Morgan was serving any condition of
- 3 a sentence on April the 9th, 2019?
- 4 A. I didn't know anything about a sentence.
- Q. Okay. Did the Michigan State Police issue a warrant to go
- 6 to Mr. Morgan's grandmother home?
- 7 A. No.

- 8 Q. Okay. What would you do if you witnessed police
- 9 entrapment in your department?
- 10 A. Well, I would --
- 11 MR. VAN WERT: Your Honor, objection. This witness
- 12  $\parallel$  is a fact witness. He is asking him hypotheticals. I don't
- 13 understand the relevance of that question.
- 14 THE COURT: What's the relevance of that?
- 15 DEFENDANT MORGAN: To test his credibility.
- 16 THE COURT: I don't believe it does. The objection
- 17 is sustained.
- 18 BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
- 19 Q. Did the Michigan -- did the Michigan State Police
- 20 Department issue a warrant to go to the pharmacy that
- 21 Mr. Morgan was attending?
- 22 A. No.
- 23 Q. Did you have a warrant to follow the medical transport
- 24 vehicle that was responsible for taking Mr. Morgan to all his
- 25 medical-related appointments?

- A. No. No. No warrant to follow you.
- Q. How did you find out that Mr. Morgan was at a pharmacy on
- 3 April 9th, 2019?
- 4 A. Through our investigation led us to your pharmacy there --
- 5 or not your pharmacy, your physical therapy place.
- 6 Q. That wasn't my physical therapist place. I was at a
- 7 | pharmacy.
- 8 THE COURT: Do you have a question, Mr. Morgan?
- 9 DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes. I asked it. I asked him,
- 10 did he have -- did he have a warrant to follow the medical
- 11 transport vehicle that was responsible for taking Mr. Morgan
- 12 to all medical-related appointments.
- 13 THE COURT: Yeah. And he answered that. He said no.
- 14 Do you have another question?
- 15 BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
- 16 Q. How did you obtain the location where Mr. Morgan was at on
- 17 April the 9th, 2019?
- 18 A. That was through our investigation.
- 19 Q. I said the location.
- 20 A. The location is, we had a possible vehicle that he would
- 21 be operating under and we had that possible vehicle.
- 22 Q. Who was driving that vehicle?
- 23 A. I don't know. By the time we got to the physical therapy
- 24 place, we observed a possible vehicle for Mr. Morgan and we
- 25 established a perimeter on the building. So we were not -- we

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
were not certain. We can't 100 percent say, and to this day I
don't know whose vehicle it was, but we had a probable vehicle
that we followed up with and established that perimeter around
the building.
    Where did you obtain the information to the vehicle from?
         MR. VAN WERT: Objection; relevance, your Honor.
         THE COURT: What difference does that make?
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: If he had probable cause to be
following a medical transport vehicle, because it wasn't my
vehicle. It was my first time at that location. So I'm
trying to find out exactly how did he get the legal -- the
legal warrant to, you know, be at that place that day, because
I have some paperwork that states that he obtained a ping off
a signal of my cell phone.
         THE COURT: So what?
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: That's why I'm asking the question.
         THE COURT: I say, what difference does that make
with respect to the charge in this case?
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: To see if it was a legal warrant
issued to that location, being that it was my first day being
at that pharmacy.
         THE COURT: Well, the -- if you are trying to
challenge the legality of the arrest, you should have done
that before trial.
```

DEFENDANT MORGAN: Oh, I did.

```
So this is not the time to do that.
 1
 2
      do you have another question?
 3
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
 4
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
 5
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
 6
          Was you in charge of the investigation involving the
 7
     semi-truck accident?
 8
          I'm not aware of a semi-truck accident, so no.
 9
          On March 8th, 2019, do you ever recall telling Gemar, you
10
     need to speak to him about a semi-truck accident?
11
          I remember that you called me at some point.
12
          Do you remember the nature of that conversation?
13
          I remember I tried to get you to turn yourself in, and I
14
     believe that you inquired as to why I was at a family member's
15
     house asking for you.
          Did Mr. Morgan ever provide you with an attorney's
16
     information that day?
17
18
          I don't recall. I think you said, contact your attorney,
19
     but never -- no information to contact any attorney was given.
20
          Okay. Do you have records of your phone?
21
          I don't have records of my phone, no.
22
          Okay. According to your investigation, do you have any
23
     records showing that Mr. Morgan was serving a lifetime
24
     sentence?
25
     Α.
          No.
```

```
Q. Okay. If a person successfully complete probation or parole, what gives the criminal justice system the right to treat the person as if they are a criminal for life?

MR. VAN WERT: Objection, your Honor, as to relevance.
```

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

MR. VAN WERT: Thank you, your Honor.

## BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. Do you have any records of Mr. Morgan committing any crime as a semi-truck driver?
- 11 A. No. I acted under a valid felony warrant for your arrest 12 out of Allen Park Police Department.
- 13 Q. Can you please present that warrant?
- A. The issue was in LEIN. There is a copy of the system ID

  number, which is the unique multi-digit number that's assigned

  when it's entered into LEIN, which is Law Enforcement

  Information Network. It would -- a copy of the warrant or a
- copy of the system ID number would be in my report, showing that it was active at the time of the arrest.
- 20 Q. Do you know the definition of discharge?
- 21  $\blacksquare$  A. I think it can be used in a lot of different contexts.
- Q. From a prior -- do you know the definition of a discharge from a prior conviction?
- MR. VAN WERT: Objection as to relevance, your Honor.
- 25 THE COURT: How is this relevant?

```
DEFENDANT MORGAN: Excuse me?
 1
 2
               THE COURT: How is this relevant, Mr. Morgan? What
 3
      does it have to do with the issues in the case?
 4
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Because they -- the title, they
 5
      say I was a prohibited person on April the 9th, 2019, which I
 6
               I wasn't a prohibited person.
      wasn't.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay.
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I did everything up under the
 8
 9
      Constitution and the laws that required for me to restore my
10
      rights as a commercial truck driver to get certain enhancement
11
      for my CDL, and I completed them, the requirements for
12
      restoring them rights. So as of April the 9th, 2019, I had
13
      rights restored.
14
               THE COURT: Well, that's an argument that you are
15
      making, but what does it have to do with this witness?
16
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Because he arrested me upon felon
17
      in possession.
18
               THE COURT:
                          No, he arrested you on a warrant out of
19
      another court.
2.0
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  Okay.
21
               THE COURT: At least that's what his testimony is.
22
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Okay.
23
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
24
          Okay. Do you know the definition of malicious arrest?
25
          Not an exact definition. I understand what the term
```

```
l means.
```

- Q. Could you elaborate?
- 3 A. Malicious arrest?
- 4 Q. Yes.
- 5 A. I'm telling you that I would probably understand what a
- 6 malicious arrest was. In this case, it was, I want to say, as
- 7 routine as possible. There was no physical harm. There was no
- 8 | foul play. No -- it was a valid warrant and we fulfilled that
- 9 warrant for Allen Park Police Department.
- 10 Q. Okay. Due to the -- who issued the warrant; Allen Park
- 11 Police Department or Michigan State Police?
- 12 A. Nothing -- really, nothing other than the fact that I'm
- 13 memployed by Michigan State Police. The warrant was through
- 14 ■ Allen Park Police Department and their -- I believe it's
- 15 24th District Court.
- 16  $\parallel$  Q. And could you please state for the record exactly what
- 17 | that warrant indicated, the addresses, the peoples, the
- 18 commodity, the property, that was in that warrant?
- 19 A. I'm sorry, you're asking for what now?
- 20 Q. The addresses, the commodity of the property, and the
- 21 peoples that was stated in that warrant.
- 22 A. So my job as a task force officer is just to fulfill these
- 23 warrants and find people with felony warrants. I had nothing
- 24 to do with the original complaint that generated this warrant
- 25 with Allen Park. I just know at the time there was a valid

```
warrant, which was again my job.
```

So in terms of talking about the commodities, I know it was a weapons -- felony for weapons offense, and there was subsequent charges along with that, multiple counts, was like the more common thing. I know there was multiple counts for a felony warrant. That's what I acted on.

- Q. Did it have an address in that warrant?
- A. I believe one --

MR. VAN WERT: Your Honor, I'm going to object as to relevance, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't see how this is relevant to the charge, Mr. Morgan. Do you?

DEFENDANT MORGAN: To see if it was a legal arrest warrant. Up under the Fourth Amendment, it's a stipulation for a seize warrant and an arrest warrant.

THE COURT: This is not the time to challenge the validity of the arrest. If you had a challenge to the validity of the arrest, you were required under Rule 12 to file a pretrial motion in that regard, which you didn't do. So trying -- addressing that issue at trial is too late. The question is whether or not the Government can prove that you possessed a firearm as a prohibited person and the firearm traveled in interstate commerce. The fact that the firearm was discovered in the course of an arrest is really irrelevant at this point.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
DEFENDANT MORGAN: Well, when I just tried to assert
the law in regards to interstate commerce transactions, I'm a
truck driver, up under every interstate commerce transaction
you must present a bill of lading. And I -- you told me I
couldn't ask him if he got a bill of lading. He alleged that
the firearm traveled in interstate commerce. As a requirement
of that law, you must have a bill of lading or you can't
transport anything in interstate commerce.
        THE COURT: I understand that that's your position,
but that's not correct, and I have told you that before.
        DEFENDANT MORGAN: I have this in my truck. That is
correct. I cannot pick up a load without --
        THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, quiet. I'm not going to
argue with you about the law. I'm going to tell you what the
        If you disagree with it, you have your remedies.
        Do you have any further questions for this witness?
        DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                           No.
        THE COURT: All right. Does the Government have any
redirect?
        MR. VAN WERT: No, your Honor.
                                        Thank you.
        THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kross. You are excused.
        THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.
        THE COURT:
                   Would you mind taking that exhibit back
to the Government, though?
        MR. VAN WERT: May I approach the witness?
```

```
1
               THE COURT:
                          I'll tell you what, go ahead and get
 2
      that, Mr. Van Wert.
 3
               MR. VAN WERT:
                              Thank you.
 4
               THE COURT: Mr. Van Wert, are you taking the next
 5
      witness?
 6
               MR. VAN WERT: Yes, your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: You may call your next witness.
 8
               MR. VAN WERT: Thank you, Judge. The Government
 9
      calls Officer Darren Long.
10
               THE COURT: Is Mr. Long in the courtroom?
11
               MR. VAN WERT: I believe he is in the hallway, your
12
      Honor.
13
               THE COURT: All right. You may retrieve him.
14
               Are you Darren Long?
15
               THE WITNESS: Yes.
16
               THE COURT: Would you come forward, please?
               Would you pause right there? Raise your right hand
17
18
      and be sworn.
19
         (Witness sworn at 2:24 p.m.)
20
               THE COURT: Thank you. Would you have a seat right
21
      over here in the witness box?
22
               Mr. Long, try to adjust the microphone so you can
23
      speak into the tip of it. And state your full name and spell
24
      your last name for the jury.
25
               THE WITNESS: Darren Long. Last name is L-o-n-g.
```

```
1
               THE COURT:
                           Keep your voice at that level when you
 2
      testify, please.
 3
               THE WITNESS: Yes.
 4
               THE COURT: You may proceed.
 5
                               Thank you, your Honor.
               MR. VAN WERT:
 6
 7
                                 DARREN LONG
 8
                   was called as a witness, after having
 9
                  been duly sworn to testify to the truth.
10
11
                            DIRECT EXAMINATION
12
     BY MR. VAN WERT:
13
          Officer Long, can you tell us where you're employed?
14
          With the Detroit Police Department.
15
          How long have you been an officer with the Detroit Police
16
     Department?
17
          It will be eleven years.
18
          What is your current assignment?
     Q.
19
          Right now I'm with the FAST unit. It's a fugitive team in
20
     Wayne County.
21
               THE COURT: Mr. Long, you're going to have to speak
22
      up, I guess. I'm having trouble hearing you myself. I don't
23
      know if the jurors are having trouble.
24
     BY MR. VAN WERT:
25
          So you indicated your current assignment is with the FAST
```

- 1 team; correct?
- 2 A. Yes. It's a multi fugitive team in Wayne County.
- 3 Q. Okay. Take you back to April 9 of 2019. What was your
- 4 assignment back in April of 2019?
- 5 A. I was with DFAT, which is the Detroit Fugitive
- 6 Apprehension Team headed by the Marshals and other local
- 7 agencies.
- 8 | Q. Okay. What were your duties as a member of the DFAT team?
- 9 A. I was a task force officer.
- 10 Q. What did that task force do?
- 11 A. Fugitive apprehension. I was assigned cases.
- 12 Q. Okay. Now, back in April 2019 were you assigned to the
- 13 DFAT team with Trooper Brian Kross?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Okay. Were you made aware that Trooper Kross had received
- 16 an assignment to locate someone named Gemar Kinte Morgan?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Okay. And were you assisting Trooper Kross in locating
- 19 Mr. Morgan?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Okay. Specifically, let's go back to April 9 of 2019.
- 22 Were you working that day as a task force officer with the
- 23 DFAT team?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25  $\parallel$  Q. Were you working that day with Trooper Kross?

```
Α.
          Yes.
 2
          Did you make any attempts that day to locate someone named
 3
     Gemar Morgan?
 4
     Α.
          Yes.
 5
          What attempts were made?
          We went to a -- it was a physical therapy building in
 6
 7
     Warren, Michigan.
 8
          Was that at 28671 Hoover Street?
 9
         Yes, I believe so.
     Α.
10
                 That's located within the Eastern District of
          Okay.
11
     Michigan; correct?
12
     Α.
          Yes.
13
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Objection, your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: What's the objection, Mr. Morgan?
15
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: He is basically, you know,
16
      coercing him on what to say and I feel that's
      unconstitutional.
17
18
               THE COURT: Well, it's not unconstitutional.
19
      construe the objection as suggesting that you're leading the
20
      witness. So try to refrain from that.
21
               MR. VAN WERT: I'll rephrase, your Honor. Thank you.
22
               THE COURT: Yeah.
23
     BY MR. VAN WERT:
24
        When you first responded to that location in Warren, what
```

did you do?

- 1  $\blacksquare$  A. I took visual in the back of the building.
- 2 Q. Did any other officers with your team also locate in the
- 3 back of the building?
- 4 A. Yes. Kross was back there with me also.
- 5 Q. Okay. Can you tell us what type of vehicle you were
- 6 driving that day?
- 7 A. A gray 2008 Ford F150.
- 8 Q. What type of clothing were you wearing?
- 9 A. Plain clothes, but I had -- I have a vest carrier with
- 10 markings, police markings on it.
- 11 \ Q. Okay. So the vest identifies you as a police officer?
- 12 A. Correct.
- 13 | Q. Okay. Now, prior to arriving at that location did you
- 14 have a profile of Gemar Morgan?
- 15 A. Yes. From the photos that Kross had showed me, yes.
- 16 Q. So you had a photograph of him?
- 17 A. Correct.
- 18  $\parallel$  Q. Now, while you were there at that location in Warren did
- 19 you, in fact, observe Gemar Morgan?
- 20 A. Yes. Not at that moment, but yes, I did.
- 21 Q. Eventually you did?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. How long had you been there before you first saw
- 24 Mr. Morgan?
- 25 A. Probably been there an hour, I would say.

- 1  $\blacksquare$  Q. Where was Mr. Morgan when you first saw him?
- 2 A. Brian Kross had alerted me that Moore -- he had confirmed
- 3 | that it was Moore coming out the back of the building, and
- 4 | that's when my eyes was drawn to the door and I seen Mr. Moore
- 5 exit the back of the building.
- 6 Q. Okay. And the person you refer to as Mr. Morgan, do you
- 7 see him here in court today?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Can you point to him and tell me what color shirt he is
- 10 wearing?
- 11 A. The red button up -- I mean, I'm sorry, black button up
- 12 with white dots.
- MR. VAN WERT: Ask the record reflect the
- 14 | identification of the Defendant Gemar Morgan. Thank you,
- 15 your Honor.
- 16 BY MR. VAN WERT:
- 17  $\blacksquare$  Q. So how did you respond when you saw the Defendant walk out
- 18 of that building?
- 19 A. Brian let us know that was him. We confirmed it. We
- 20 | suited up. We approached kind of in our vehicles and then
- 21 | hurried up and got out and approached him on foot.
- 22  $\parallel$  Q. That point in time, were you wearing your vest with police
- 23 markings on it?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Did you identify yourself in any way?

- A. Yes.
- 2 Q. How did you identify yourself?
- 3 A. Told him, "Police. Stop."
- 4 Q. Okay. How did the Defendant react?
- 5 A. He threw -- I think he was in shock. He threw a whole
- 6 bunch of cookies on the floor and that's when I was able to
- 7 gain control of him.
- 8 Q. Okay. Where did those cookies come from?
- 9 A. I don't know. He either had them in his hand or to the
- 10 side of his body, but he threw a whole bunch of cookies. It
- 11 was a lot of them.
- 12 Q. You said at that point in time you were able to gain
- 13 control of him. How exactly did you do that?
- 14 A. Gained control, I think I maybe grabbed his arm or
- 15 shoulder and started handcuffing him.
- 16 Q. Okay. Why was the Defendant being arrested at that point
- 17 in time?
- 18 A. He had a felony warrant, I remember that, out of Allen
- 19 Park.
- 20 Q. Okay. So you said that he dropped some items on the
- 21  $\parallel$  floor. Were you inside the building or outside the building?
- 22 A. We were outside the building in the parking lot. I'm
- 23 sorry.
- 24 Q. So when you began putting handcuffs on the Defendant were
- 25 | you, in fact, able to fully handcuff him?

- A. Yes.
- 2 Q. How was he acting before that moment in time?
- A. He kind of tensed up on me, but at that point, at that moment, just tensing up on me.
- 5 Q. All right. When you first saw him, how was he acting?
- 6 How was he acting when he walked out of the building?
- 7 A. He walked out of there. He didn't see us. So kind of
- 8 | just strolled out of there. Was minding his own business, I
- 9 would say.
- 10 Q. When you handcuffed the Defendant, what were the other
- 11 officers in your team doing?
- 12 A. So Brian was in front of me. I was behind the Defendant
- 13 | cuffing him. And that's when Brian alerted me that he found a
- 14 | handgun on the subject.
- 15 | Q. What did you see? Did you see the gun?
- 16 A. Yes. I seen the gun. It was a silver, small -- as I call
- 17 | it, pocket -- pocket pistol, as I refer to it.
- 18 Q. Okay. Did you see where Trooper Kross located that gun?
- 19 A. No. No.
- 20 Q. Okay. How did the Defendant react when Trooper Kross
- 21 | found that gun?
- 22 A. Once Trooper Kross alerted me that he found the handgun,
- 23 Mr. Morgan, I still had him by the handcuffs, went to a dead
- 24 weight going towards the ground. So I kind of just helped him,
- 25 assist him going to the ground. He was screaming that his --

```
that he was in pain.
 2
          Okay. Do you know what Trooper Kross did with that
 3
     firearm after he found it?
 4
               I was focused on Mr. Morgan.
     Α.
 5
          Sure.
 6
     Α.
         But I --
 7
         Based on how the Defendant was acting, was any type of
 8
     assistance called?
 9
          Yes. We called for EMS.
10
                 That ambulance actually arrived; correct?
          Okay.
11
          Yes.
     Α.
12
          And took the Defendant?
13
     Α.
         Yes.
14
         After that happened did you have any further role in this
15
     investigation?
16
     Α.
         No.
17
               MR. VAN WERT: Nothing further, your Honor.
                                                              Thank
18
      you.
19
               THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, do you have any questions
20
      for Mr. Long?
21
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                   Yes.
22
               THE COURT:
                          You may proceed.
23
                              CROSS EXAMINATION
24
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
```

Do you allege that the firearm traveled in interstate

```
1 commerce?
```

- 2 A. I'm sorry?
- 3 Q. Do you allege that the firearm traveled in interstate
- 4 commerce?
- 5 A. I don't -- I don't even know what you mean by that, sir.
- 6 Q. Okay. Do you have -- did you all conduct a forensic lab
- 7 report of the firearm?
- 8 A. I didn't, no.
- 9 Q. Was it ever -- was it ever any fingerprints taken of the
- 10 | firearm?
- 11 A. I don't know that.
- 12 Q. Okay. Is it possible for a police officer to make a
- 13 | mistake?
- 14 A. Pretty sure, yes.
- 15 Q. Okay. Do you allege that Mr. Morgan traveled across state
- 16 lines?
- 17 A. No. Not at that point. I'm just there for a felony
- 18 warrant and warrant.
- 19 Q. Okay. According to April 9, 2019, where did you take
- 20 Mr. Morgan?
- 21 A. I did not take Mr. Morgan anywhere.
- 22 Q. Okay. Have you ever lied under oath to cover up the
- 23 truth?
- 24 A. No.
- 25 Q. Okay. Could you state your job title and ID for the

- 1 entity that you work for?
- 2 A. I'm sorry?
- 3 Q. Could you state your job title and ID for the entity --
- 4 A. I'm a police officer with Detroit Police and my badge is
- 5 4539.
- 6 Q. Okay. Do you remember the documentation that's in that
- 7 warrant that you all retrieved?
- 8 A. Negative.
- 9 Q. You say what?
- 10 A. Negative. No.
- 11 Q. Did you all have a legal warrant?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And who issued that warrant?
- 14 A. Allen Park.
- 15 Q. How do you know?
- 16 A. I read the LEIN message.
- 17 Q. Excuse me?
- 18 A. The LEIN message.
- 19 Q. And you never looked at it?
- 20 A. Yes, I read it. I just told you I read the LEIN message.
- 21  $\parallel$  Q. What was the -- what was the address in that warrant?
- 22 A. I don't recall that.
- 23 Q. Did it have any property in that warrant?
- 24 A. Don't recall that, sir.
- 25 Q. Okay. Have you ever communicated with a trucking Company

```
that Mr. Morgan worked for?
 2
     Α.
          No.
 3
          Okay. Did you ever go to Mr. Morgan's grandmother house?
 4
     Α.
          No.
 5
                 According to the investigation, do you have any
 6
     records showing that Mr. Morgan was serving a lifetime
 7
     sentence?
 8
     Α.
          No.
 9
                 According to your records, do it state that
     Mr. Morgan was serving any sentence during April the 9th, 2019?
10
11
         Negative. I don't know. No. I wasn't in charge of the
12
     case, sir.
13
          Okay. Do you have any records of Mr. Morgan committing
14
     any crimes as a semi-truck driver?
15
     Α.
          No.
16
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  That's all, your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: Thank you. Any redirect?
18
               MR. VAN WERT:
                             No, your Honor. Thank you.
19
               THE COURT: Mr. Long, thank you. You are excused.
2.0
               THE WITNESS: Thank you.
21
               THE COURT: The Government may call its next witness.
22
               MR. VAN WERT:
                              Thank you, your Honor. The Government
23
      calls Trooper John Comer.
24
               THE COURT: And who is getting Mr. Comer?
25
               MR. VAN WERT: I'll retrieve him, if the Court allows.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Are you John Comer?
 2
               THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
 3
               THE COURT: Would you step up here, please? Just
 4
      pause right there for a moment. Raise your right hand and be
 5
      sworn.
 6
         (Witness sworn at 2:36 p.m.)
 7
               THE COURT: Would you have a seat right over here in
 8
      the witness box, please?
 9
               THE WITNESS: Thank you.
10
               THE COURT: Please adjust the microphone so you can
11
      speak into the tip of it. And would you state your full name
12
      and spell your last name for the jury?
13
               THE WITNESS: My name is Jonathan Comer, C-o-m-e-r.
14
               THE COURT: Thank you.
15
               Counsel, you may proceed.
16
               MR. VAN WERT:
                              Thank you, your Honor.
17
18
                               JONATHAN COMER
19
                   was called as a witness, after having
20
                  been duly sworn to testify to the truth.
21
22
                            DIRECT EXAMINATION
23
     BY MR. VAN WERT:
24
          Trooper Comer, can you tell us where you're employed?
25
     Α.
          I'm employed with the Michigan State Police.
```

- 1 Q. How long have you been a Trooper with the Michigan State
- 2 Police?
- 3 A. Approximately eleven years.
- 4 Q. Do you have any other law enforcement experience?
- 5 A. I do not.
- 6 Q. What's your current assignment?
- 7 A. My current assignment is, I'm a sergeant at the training
- 8 academy. I coordinate and conduct training in Lansing.
- 9 Q. What was your assignment back in April of 2019?
- 10 A. I was a member of DFAT, the Detroit Fugitive Apprehension
- 11 Team, which is a multi-jurisdictional task force involved in
- 12 | locating and arresting fugitives.
- 13 Q. Were you assigned to the same team as Trooper Brian Kross?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Let me take you back to early 2019. Was your team
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18  $\parallel$  Q. Okay. Why were you instructed to locate that person?
- 19 A. He had a current felony warrant out of Allen Park.
- 20 Q. Were you the lead on that assignment or was that Trooper
- 21 Kross?
- 22 A. It was not me. It was Trooper Kross.
- 23 Q. Take you back to April 9, 2019. Were you working that day
- 24 with Trooper Kross?
- 25 A. Yes, I was.

- 1  $\square$  Q. As a member of DFAT?
- 2 A. Yes, I was.
- 3 Q. Did you make any attempts to locate and arrest Gemar
- 4 Morgan that day?
- 5 A. On that date, yes.
- 6 Q. What did you do?
- 7 A. I provided backup and extra bodies for surveillance in the 8 area which we ended up locating him.
- 9 Q. Where was he located?
- 10 A. It was at a physical therapy center off of Hoover, I
- 11 believe.
- 12 Q. What city was that in?
- 13 A. Warren.
- Q. Okay. When you first responded to that location, exactly
- 15 where did you go?
- 16 A. I went to the rear of the building, which I believe would
- 17 | be the west side of the building. There was a back parking lot
- 18  $\parallel$  and I set up in that back parking lot in my vehicle.
- 19 Q. So the same area that Trooper Kross was located?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21  $\parallel$  Q. Prior to that date did you have a basic profile of Gemar
- 22 Morgan?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. As part of that did you have his photograph?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1  $\blacksquare$  Q. And that day did you, in fact, observe Gemar Morgan?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Where did you first see him?
- 4 A. I saw him when he came out of the physical therapy door
- 5 into the parking lot. That's where I first observed him.
- 6 Q. How did you respond at that point in time?
- 7  $\blacksquare$  A. The -- typically what happens is the officer in charge, in
- 8 this case it would have been Trooper Kross, would have eyes on
- 9 the front door. And the suspect, or in this case Mr. Morgan,
- 11 would put our vests on, and then approached Mr. Morgan.
- 12 | Q. Did you have any markings on that vest that day?
- 13 A. Yes. I have an external carrier vest that has "State
- 14 Police," and I wear my badge as well.
- 15  $\parallel$  Q. The person who you refer to as Mr. Morgan, do you see him
- 16 here in court today?
- 17 A. Yes, I do.
- 18  $\blacksquare$  Q. Can you point to him and tell me what color shirt he is
- 19 wearing?
- 20 | A. It's a -- he's right over here. It's dark, possibly
- 21 maroon color.
- 22 MR. VAN WERT: Record reflect the identification of
- 23 Defendant Gemar Morgan.
- 24 BY MR. VAN WERT:
- 25 Q. So when you first saw the Defendant exit the building and

- 1  $\parallel$  you approached him, what did you do?
- 2 A. I just provided backup for Trooper Kross and Officer Long.
- 3 We just basically conducted an arrest at that time.
- 4 Q. Okay. Do you recall what Officer Long did during the
- 5 | arrest?
- 6 A. Yes. He was the one that put the handcuffs on Mr. Morgan.
- 7 | Q. Okay. And as Officer Long was handcuffing the Defendant,
- 8 what did Trooper Kross do?
- 9 A. Trooper Kross conducted a search of Mr. Morgan.
- 10 Q. Did you observe that?
- 11 A. I did.
- 12 Q. Did Trooper Kross locate anything during that search?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. What did he find?
- 15 A. He first found a handful of cookies in one of his pockets,
- 16  $\parallel$  but then the second pocket, I believe the right front, is when
- 17 he located the firearm.
- 18 Q. Okay. How did the Defendant respond when Trooper Kross
- 19 | found that firearm?
- 20 A. After he found the firearm he kind of became out of
- 21 | control, belligerent, flopped on the ground. Stated he was in
- 22 pain, his back hurt.
- 23 Q. Was an ambulance called for the Defendant at that point in
- 24 time?
- 25 A. They were.

```
Did they take over treatment of the Defendant?
 2
     Α.
          Yes.
 3
          Okay. Did you make any efforts to locate any type of
 4
     surveillance video that day?
 5
          I did.
 6
         What efforts did you make?
 7
        The physical therapy location was in a strip mall and I
 8
     went to each one of the other businesses in the strip mall
 9
     looking for surveillance.
10
        Okay. Did any of those -- any of those businesses have
11
     video surveillance?
12
        No, they did not.
13
          Did you have any role in this investigation going forward
14
     from that point in time?
15
        As far as the investigation, no, but I did go to the
16
     hospital with Trooper Kross.
17
               MR. VAN WERT: Okay. Nothing further, your Honor.
18
      Thank you.
19
               THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, do you have any questions for
20
     Mr. Comer?
21
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
22
                             CROSS EXAMINATION
23
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
24
        Do you allege that the firearm traveled in interstate
```

25

commerce?

- 1  $\blacksquare$  A. I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.
- 2 Q. Do you allege that the firearm traveled across state line?
- 3 A. I -- I don't know if it traveled across state lines, no.
- 4 | Q. Do you allege that Mr. Morgan traveled across state line?
- 5 A. I don't know.
- 6 Q. Was it ever a forensic lab report done on the firearm?
- 7  $\blacksquare$  A. I -- I had nothing to do with the investigation as far as
- 8 after you were under arrest. Typically what happens is any
- 9 | firearm is submitted to a lab, but I -- again, I don't know
- 10 personally, no.
- 11  $\parallel$  Q. Was there any fingerprints done to that firearm?
- 12 A. I don't know.
- 13 Q. Okay. Have you ever lied under oath to cover up the
- 14 **∥** truth?
- 15 A. No.
- 16  $\parallel$  Q. Now, you said you obtained a -- what was it, a search
- 17 warrant, a seize warrant, or an arrest warrant?
- 18 A. I did not obtain any warrant at all.
- 19 Q. What was your purpose being at that location?
- 20 A. My purpose would be backup for the officer in charge,
- 21 which would have been Trooper Kross.
- 22 Q. Who dispatched you all for that location?
- 23 A. We did not get dispatched to that location.
- 24 Q. Now, you say your job was to back up officer who?
- 25  $\blacksquare$  A. Trooper Kross, who was the officer in charge.

```
Did he ever present a warrant to you all?
 2
     Α.
          Yes. An arrest warrant.
 3
          Did it state addresses in it?
     Q.
 4
     Α.
          I believe it did.
 5
          What was the address in that warrant?
 6
          I don't know what the address was.
 7
          What about the -- did it state any property in that
 8
     warrant?
 9
               It does not say any property in the arrest warrant.
10
          Did it have any other specific location in that warrant?
     Q.
11
          A specific location, no, I don't believe so.
     Α.
12
          Did it have any license plates in that warrant or vehicle?
          Not that I recall.
13
     Α.
14
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: That's it, your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: No further questions, Mr. Morgan.
16
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                   No.
17
               THE COURT: Thank you.
18
               Any further questions?
19
               MR. VAN WERT: Just very briefly, your Honor.
2.0
                            REDIRECT EXAMINATION
21
     BY MR. VAN WERT:
22
          Trooper Comer, based upon those last few questions, when
23
     you're notified of an arrest warrant for a person, what
24
     information are you given?
25
          It's the name, the full name, first, middle, last, date of
```

```
birth, height and weight, color hair, color eyes, what the
     warrant is, what the -- where the warrant is out of, what
 2
 3
     police department, and what court and the jurisdiction.
 4
          Is it fair to say that warrant authorizes you to arrest
 5
     somebody; correct?
 6
          Yes.
     Α.
 7
          And you weren't part of the underlying investigation into
 8
     that Allen Park case; correct?
 9
     Α.
          I was not, no.
10
               MR. VAN WERT: Nothing further, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: Any further questions?
12
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  Yes.
13
               THE COURT:
                          Okay. Go ahead.
14
                            RECROSS EXAMINATION
15
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
16
          At the address that you all located Mr. Morgan at, was
     that -- was that his home?
17
18
               It was a physical therapy center.
     Α.
19
          What date did you all receive that address?
20
          I don't know the date that we received it.
     Α.
21
          So you never really seen the warrant yourself?
     Q.
          Yes, I would have seen the arrest warrant, yes.
22
     Α.
23
          Do you remember anything about that warrant?
     Ο.
24
          Just how I explained. Your name, first, middle, last,
```

date of birth, where the warrant was out of, what the warrant

- 1 was for.
- 2 Q. You don't remember the address that was in it?
- 3 A. I don't.
- 4 Q. Okay. Trying to figure out, how did you all obtain the --
- 5 come to a location at a pharmacy? I know you keep on saying
- 6 physical therapy, but it's a pharmacy. That was my first time
- 7 being at that place. How did you all come about that address
- 8 or the location?
- 9 A. That would have been -- that would have been part of our
- 10 investigation in this case. It would have been part of Trooper
- 11 Kross's investigation, since he was the officer in charge.
- 12 Q. Did you all have a warrant to follow the medical transport
- 13 vehicle around?
- 14 ■ A. I'm not -- I'm not aware of any medical transport vehicle.
- 15 Q. Was you all -- did you all have any warrant to go to any
- 16 other facilities?
- 17 A. I quess I'm --
- 18  $\parallel$  Q. Doctor's office. My physical therapist place was in
- 19 | Farmington, that's why I'm kind of concerned.
- 20 A. Okay. I guess your arrest warrant, is that what you're
- 21 asking? I'm confused at what the question is.
- 22 Q. I'm just trying to -- I'm trying to get an understanding
- 23 of what was involved in that legal -- if it was a legal arrest
- 24 warrant.
- 25 A. Well, the arrest warrant was issued out of Allen Park.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
I had no part of the investigation for the warrant.
specific job duties would be to obtain or locate and arrest
the fugitive. In this case would be you, Mr. Morgan.
    So how did you know it was Mr. Morgan in that warrant
then?
Α.
    I'm sorry?
   How did you all know it was Mr. Morgan in that warrant?
         What specifics that the warrant indicated to
positively identify that it was Mr. Morgan?
    Like we just stated a little bit ago, your full name, your
date of birth, your height and weight, eye color, hair color.
   Now, before this date did you all ever have, like,
pictures of Mr. Morgan?
Α.
    Yes.
    And where did them pictures come from?
    Came from LEIN or Secretary of State.
    Okay. Did you all ever communicate with an insurance
Company?
    I did not, no.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: Okay. No further questions, your
Honor.
         THE COURT: Mr. Van Wert, do you have any further
questions?
         MR. VAN WERT: No, your Honor. Thank you.
```

Mr. Comer, when you observed Mr. Morgan

THE COURT:

```
in April in Warren in the parking lot, was he wearing a
2
      cervical collar at the time?
 3
               THE WITNESS: I don't believe so, but I'm not
 4
      100 percent. I don't think he was.
 5
               THE COURT: You know what I mean by that?
 6
               THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.
7
               THE COURT: You see that he is wearing one now?
8
               THE WITNESS: I do.
 9
               THE COURT: So you don't remember whether he was or
10
     not?
11
               THE WITNESS: I don't believe he was, no.
12
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
13
               Anything else?
14
              MR. VAN WERT: No, your Honor. Thank you.
15
               THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, anything further?
16
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Excuse me?
17
               THE COURT: Any further questions?
18
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  No.
19
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
2.0
              Mr. Comer, you are excused.
21
               THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
22
               THE COURT: You may call your next witness.
23
               MR. VAN WERT:
                             Thank you, your Honor. Government
24
     calls Special Agent David Salazar.
25
               THE COURT: And he is not in the courtroom either?
```

```
1
               MR. VAN WERT:
                             He is in the hallway, your Honor.
 2
               THE COURT: Okay. Are you David Salazar?
 3
               THE WITNESS: Yes, I am, sir.
 4
               THE COURT: Would you step forward, please?
 5
      pause right there for a moment. Raise your right hand and be
 6
      sworn.
 7
         (Witness sworn at 2:50 p.m.)
 8
               THE COURT: Would you have a seat right over here in
 9
      the witness box, please?
10
               THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
11
               THE COURT: Mr. Salazar, pull the microphone -- well,
12
      adjust it just like that so you can speak right into the tip
      of it.
13
14
               State your full name and spell your last name for the
15
      jury.
16
               THE WITNESS: David Salazar, S-a-l-a-z-a-r.
17
               THE COURT: Counsel, you may proceed.
18
               MR. VAN WERT: Thank you, your Honor.
19
20
21
                                DAVID SALAZAR
22
                   was called as a witness, after having
23
                  been duly sworn to testify to the truth.
24
25
```

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. VAN WERT:

1

- 3 Q. Agent Salazar, can you tell us where you're employed?
  - A. Yes. I'm a Special Agent with the Bureau of Alcohol,
- 5 Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.
- 6 Q. How long have you been an agent with the Bureau or ATF?
- 7 A. Over five years.
- 8 Q. What are your current duties as a special agent with ATF?
- 9 A. I investigate crimes mostly concerning firearms and
- 10 narcotics and I am also an interstate nexus expert.
- 11 Q. Do you have any other law enforcement experience?
- 12 A. Yes. Prior to working for ATF I was a Detroit police
- 13 officer for over 17 years.
- 14 | Q. Throughout your law enforcement career have you received
- 15 training in the use of firearms?
- 16 A. Yes, I have.
- 17 Q. Can you tell us what type of training you have received?
- 18 A. Handling of firearms and firearms qualification.
- 19 Q. Is that both with Detroit Police Department and now with
- 20 ATF?
- 21 A. Yes, it is.
- 22 Q. How many times throughout your career in law enforcement
- 23 have you fired a weapon in training?
- 24 A. Well over 10,000, I would say.
- 25  $\blacksquare$  Q. What types of weapons were you trained in the use of?

- A. Handguns, shotguns, rifles.
- 2 Q. As a Special Agent with ATF have you been trained in
- 3 making interstate nexus determinations of firearms?
- 4 A. Yes, I am.
- Q. Can you tell us, what -- what is interstate nexus
- 6 determination?
- 7 A. The determination is first identifying the firearm, and
- 8 then from there you locate where the firearm was manufactured,
- 9 and then whether or not it crossed state lines.
- 10 Q. Okay. In order to make that -- in order to make those
- 11 determinations did you have to receive or go to or attend any
- 12 type of training?
- 13 A. Yes, I did.
- 14  $\parallel$  Q. Can you tell us about the training in that area that you
- 15 have received?
- 16 ■ A. Yes. I can -- I attended a week-long training that was
- 17 conducted by ATF in Huntsville, Alabama. And also during that
- 18 | training I toured Remington Manufacturing Company.
- 19 Q. And during that week-long training what type of topics
- 20 were you trained on?
- 21  $\blacksquare$  A. How to identify -- properly identify a firearm and just
- 22  $\parallel$  different ways to determine where a firearm is manufactured.
- 23 Q. Are there other resources that you use when you make an
- 24 interstate nexus determination of a firearm?
- 25 A. Yes. There's different publications I use, internet

```
searches, anything -- any way I can get additional information of the manufacturer.
```

- Q. All right. When you talk about making an interstate nexus determination of a firearm, are you referring to firearms that were collected or received by ATF as evidence in ongoing
- 6 criminal investigations?
- 7 A. Yes, I am.

3

4

- Q. So if ATF has recovered or they have received a firearm,
  based on your training and experience, how do you go -- how do
  you determine whether that weapon is, in fact, a firearm?
- A. Basically, sometimes we will test fire it or I'll just do
  a test at my desk with the firearm unloaded to make sure it
  functions as it is manufactured to.
- Q. Do you also examine the weapon itself, the markings on the weapon?
- 16 A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Then do you take that information and compare it with your reference guides?
- 19 A. Yes, I do.
- DEFENDANT MORGAN: Objection, your Honor.
- 21 THE COURT: Yes, what's your objection?
- DEFENDANT MORGAN: The prosecutor is coercing this witness to basically answer exactly how he want him to answer.
- THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure that's the case, but
- 25 I'll take it as an objection that the questions are leading,

- $\mathbb{I}$  and  $\mathbb{I}$  will sustain that objection.
- 2 MR. VAN WERT: I'll rephrase going forward, your
- 3 Honor. Thank you.
- 4 BY MR. VAN WERT:
- 5 Q. Now, Agent, you indicated that another part of your
- 6 determination is determining whether a firearm has traveled in
- 7 | interstate commerce; correct?
- 8 A. Yes, it is.
- 9 Q. How do you make that determination?
- 10 A. I will find the markings on the firearm to determine the
- 11 manufacturer of the firearm, and then I will look up where that
- 12 | manufacturer actually manufactures their firearms.
- 13 Q. How many times in your career after you attended that
- 14 | training have you looked at a firearm and made a determination
- 15  $\parallel$  as to whether it traveled in interstate or foreign commerce?
- 16 A. I have done anywhere, 50, 75 interstate nexus
- 17 determinations.
- 18 \ Q. In those cases do you prepare reports of your findings?
- 19 A. Yes, I do.
- 20 Q. Have you previously testified in court regarding an
- 21  $\parallel$  interstate nexus determination that you have made on a firearm?
- 22 A. Yes, I have.
- 23 Q. Or about ammunition?
- 24 A. Yes, I have.
- 25 Q. Approximately how many times?

- 1 A. Twice in Federal Court.
- 2 Q. Do you recall when? When you testified?
- 3 A. Yes. February of 2018 and November of 2018.
- 4 | Q. And both times that was in Federal Court; correct?
- 5 A. Yes, it was.
- 6 Q. Throughout your career have you also conducted test
- 7 | firings of firearms to determine whether a firearm is
- 8 | functional?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Approximately how many times have you test fired a firearm
- 11 to see whether it was functional?
- 12 A. I have conducted probably 20, 25, somewhere around there,
- 13 maybe more.
- Q. When you test fire a weapon in that capacity, what are you
- 15 | trying to determine?
- 16 A. To makes sure it functions as it is designed. So
- 17 basically loading the firearm with ammunition and pulling the
- 18  $\parallel$  trigger and seeing if it expels the projectile.
- 19 Q. In this case did you examine the firearm?
- 20 A. Yes, I did.
- 21 MR. VAN WERT: Your Honor, may I approach the witness
- 22 with Government Exhibit Number 1?
- 23 THE COURT: You may.
- MR. VAN WERT: Thank you, your Honor.
- 25 BY MR. VAN WERT:

- Q. Agent Salazar, I'm showing you what's been already admitted as Government Exhibit Number 1.
- 3 Do you recognize that item?
- $4 \parallel A$ . Yes. This is the firearm I conducted a determination on.
- 5 Q. Did you examine that exact firearm for this case?
- 6 A. Yes, I did.
- 7 Q. Why did you examine that firearm?
- 8 A. To complete a determination on the firearm, whether or not
- 9 | it traveled in interstate nexus or interstate commerce.
- 10 Q. Can you tell us what type of weapon that is?
- 11 A. Yes. This is a Raven Arms Model MP25, .25 caliber
- 12 semi-automatic pistol.
- 13 Q. Before giving us your interstate nexus determination, was
- 14 | that determination that you made based upon facts and data that
- 16 A. Yes, it was.
- 17 Q. Is that the product of specialized training that you
- 18 received in making those type of determinations?
- 19 A. Yes, it is.
- 20 Q. After examining that Government Exhibit Number 1, that
- 21  $\parallel$  firearm, that weapon, did you make a determination about
- 22 whether it is, in fact, a firearm?
- 23 **A.** Yes, it is.
- 24 Q. And what determination is that?
- 25  $\parallel$  A. That this is, indeed, a firearm based upon the definition

- 1 of a firearm.
- 2 \ Q. And what did you use to form that opinion?
- 3 A. The firearm was test fired and it functioned as a firearm.
- 4 | Q. Now, after examining that firearm did you determine
- 5 whether or not it traveled in interstate or foreign commerce?
- 6 A. Yes, I did.
- $7 \parallel Q$ . And how did you form that opinion?
- 8 A. I researched Raven Arms. Raven Arms was a manufacturer.
- 9 They are no longer in existence. But when they were, they
- 10 manufactured all their firearms in California.
- 11 | Q. Okay. And is there, in fact, a stamp on that firearm --
- 12 A. Yes, there is.
- 13 Q. -- where it was made?
- 14 A. Yes, there is.
- 15 Q. Where is that stamp located?
- 16  $\parallel$  A. It is located on the left side when holding the firearm.
- 17 | Q. Okay. What part of the firearm?
- 18 A. It's on the slide.
- 19 Q. Okay. And what does that indicate?
- 20 A. That the firearm was manufactured by Raven Arms in
- 21 Industry, California.
- 22 \ Q. And just for the record, when you're holding the firearm
- 23 in your right hand, that's -- when you're holding the firearm
- 24 in your right hand, the firearm is pointed forward, what side
- 25 is that marking on?

- 1  $\blacksquare$  A. It is on the left side.
- 2 Q. And you indicated regarding that firearm, you're aware
- 3 that it was test fired; correct?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Were you present when it was test fired?
- 6 A. Yes, I was.
- 7 | Q. Can you explain that process of how that was done?
- 8 A. Yes. The firearm was loaded and the trigger was pulled,
- 9 at which time it expelled the projectile and it ejected the
- 10 casing.
- 11  $\parallel$  Q. What was -- what was loaded into that firearm?
- 12 A. .25 caliber ammunition.
- 13 Q. Do you recall how many rounds were loaded?
- 14 | A. Two.
- 15 Q. How were those loaded into the firearm?
- 16 A. They were loaded right into the magazine and then
- 17 | loaded -- or it was loaded and then the magazine -- the slide
- 18 went forward to put it in the chamber.
- 19 Q. Okay. Then what happened next in that process?
- 20 A. It was -- the trigger was pulled.
- 21  $\parallel$  Q. And what happened when the trigger was pulled?
- 22 A. The projectile was ejected or the projectile fired through
- 23 and the spent casing was ejected.
- Q. Okay. Based upon that, did that firearm function as it
- 25 was intended?

```
Yes, it did.
     Α.
 2
          What was done with that firearm after it was test fired?
 3
          It was placed back into evidence.
 4
          Do you recall who was with you when that firearm was test
 5
     fired?
 6
                Special Agent Kenton Weston.
          Yes.
 7
          Okay. Who is the one that actually physically pulled that
 8
     trigger?
 9
          Special Agent Weston.
10
          But you were there with him when it happened?
11
          Yes, I was.
     Α.
12
               MR. VAN WERT: Okay. Nothing further, your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Morgan?
14
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                   Yes.
15
               THE COURT: You may ask.
16
                             CROSS EXAMINATION
17
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
18
          You claim you did a special report on that firearm?
19
          I did a nexus report, correct.
20
          Who did it register to?
21
          I do not conduct a registration check on the firearm.
     Α.
22
          What about a forensic lab report?
23
          I do not conduct a forensic -- I do not prepare a
24
     forensics lab report.
```

Was it ever any fingerprints taken?

- 1 A. I do not know, sir.
- Q. Okay. Now, you say you are a nexus expert?
- 3 A. Yes, sir.
- 4 Q. Do you allege that the firearm traveled in interstate
- 5 commerce?
- 6 A. Yes, it did.
- 7 | Q. Do you allege that Mr. Morgan traveled across state line?
- 8 A. I do not know that, sir. That is not what I do.
- 9 Q. When was it traveled across state lines, the firearm?
- 10 A. Sometime after it was manufactured.
- 11 Q. And what year was it manufactured?
- 12 A. The Company was active between 1971 and 19- -- 1970 and
- 13 | 1991.
- 14 Q. Okay. Are you aware of the bill of ladings that is
- 15 required in all interstate commerce transactions?
- 16 A. No, sir.
- 17 Q. Okay. Is it possible that a police officer can make a
- 18 mistake?
- 19 A. Yeah, I guess it's possible, sir.
- 20 Q. Okay. Did you participate in the arrest of Mr. Morgan?
- 21 A. No, I did not.
- 22 Q. Okay. Well, without no forensic lab report, it's really
- 23 hard to say if it was ever any -- well, was it ever any
- 24 | fingerprints taken on that?
- 25 A. I do not know, sir.

```
DEFENDANT MORGAN: Okay. Thanks a lot.
 1
 2
               No other questions.
 3
               THE COURT: No further questions?
 4
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
 5
               THE COURT: Any further questions?
 6
               MR. VAN WERT: No, your Honor. Thank you.
 7
               THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Salazar. You are excused.
 8
               THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
 9
               THE COURT: You may call your next witness.
10
               MR. VAN WERT: Your Honor, we have one additional
11
               Is it possible to take a five-minute break at this
      witness.
12
      point in time or no?
13
               THE COURT: It is possible. Are you asking for one?
14
               MR. VAN WERT:
                              I am, your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: All right. We will take a five-minute
16
      recess.
17
               Members of the jury, please don't discuss the case
18
      among yourselves. Please remain in the jury room during the
19
      break.
20
               Would you escort the jury out, please?
21
               THE CLERK: All rise for the jury.
22
         (Jury left courtroom at 3:03 p.m.)
23
               THE COURT: Five minutes enough?
24
               MR. VAN WERT: Absolutely.
25
               THE COURT: We will reconvene at 3:10 and Court is in
```

```
recess.
1
2
         (Recess taken from 3:04 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.)
 3
               THE CLERK: All rise. Court is back in recess -- or
 4
     back in session.
 5
               THE COURT: Yes. You may be seated.
               Is the Government ready for the jury?
 6
7
               MS. ISON: Yes, your Honor. I'm just wondering, we
     have digital exhibits for purposes of this witness, your
8
 9
     Honor.
10
               THE COURT: Oh, can you see that?
11
               Off the record.
12
         (Discussion held off the record at 3:15 p.m.)
13
               THE COURT: I'm sorry. Are you ready for the jury?
14
                          I am, your Honor. Thank you.
               MS. ISON:
15
               THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, are you ready for the jury?
16
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
               THE COURT: Would you bring the jury in, please?
17
18
               Is your witness in the courtroom?
19
               MS. ISON: Yes, he is, your Honor. He is right here.
2.0
               THE COURT: All right.
21
               THE CLERK: All rise for the jury.
         (Jury entered courtroom at 3:16 p.m.)
22
23
               THE COURT: You may be seated.
24
               When we took our recess, members of the jury, the
25
      Government was going to call another witness.
```

```
1
               And Ms. Ison, you may proceed.
 2
               MS. ISON:
                          Thank you, your Honor. The Government
 3
      calls Special Agent Kenton Weston.
 4
               THE COURT: Mr. Weston, would you step around, raise
 5
      your right hand and be sworn?
 6
               THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.
 7
         (Witness sworn at 3:17 p.m.)
 8
               THE COURT: Please have a seat in the witness box.
 9
               THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.
10
               THE COURT: Would you state your full name and spell
11
      your last name for the jury?
12
               THE WITNESS: My name is Kenton, K-e-n-t-o-n; Weston,
13
      W-e-s-t-o-n.
14
               THE COURT: Would you pull that microphone a little
15
      closer to you?
16
               You may proceed, Ms.
                                      Ison.
17
18
                                KENTON WESTON
19
                   was called as a witness, after having
20
                  been duly sworn to testify to the truth.
21
22
                             DIRECT EXAMINATION
23
     BY MS. ISON:
24
          Agent Weston, how are you employed?
25
     Α.
          I'm a Special Agent with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,
```

- 1  $\blacksquare$  Firearms, and Explosives.
- 2 Q. And how long have you been employed in that capacity?
- 3 A. Since January 2018.
- 4 Q. Before that how were you employed?
- A. I have ten years working as a financial statement auditor,
- 6 working primarily with the Big Three auto industry.
- 7 | Q. Are you the agent in charge of this case?
- 8 A. I am.
- 9 Q. How did you become involved in this case?
- 10 A. I was contacted by a task force officer we have with the
- 11 ATF who was originally a trooper from Michigan State Police,
- 12 and I was contacted about the facts of the case involving
- 13 Mr. Morgan.
- 14  $\parallel$  Q. And what are your duties as an ATF officer?
- 15 A. We investigate federal firearm laws focusing primarily on
- 16 | violent crimes involving those firearms. They can go anywhere
- 17 | from gun trafficking and also firearms that are utilized to
- 18 protect narcotics.
- 19 Q. You said that you were notified by a task force officer
- 20 about a particular individual. Who was that?
- 21 A. Gemar Morgan.
- 22 \ Q. And what is it that you learned about Mr. Morgan?
- 23 A. I learned that there was an arrest warrant that was
- 24 executed, and Gemar Morgan was arrested with a loaded firearm
- 25 in his front pocket.

- Q. And do you know what type of firearm that was?
- 2 A. It was a Raven Arms MP25 semi-automatic pistol.
- 3 Q. And is that the pistol that is in Government's Exhibit
- 4 Number 1?
- 5 A. It is.
- 6 Q. And have you had custody of that particular exhibit --
- 7 **A.** I have.
- 9 A. I have.
- 10 Q. After you learned of that information about Mr. Morgan
- 11 | from the task force officer, what, if anything, did you
- 12 determine?
- 13 A. I determined that Mr. Morgan was a prohibited person, that
- 14 the firearm traveled through interstate nexus, and that -- I
- 15 think this was the main two parts of it.
- 16 Q. Let's start with the first part.
- 17 How did you determine that Mr. Morgan was a
- 18 prohibited person?
- 19 A. Utilizing certified court documents, the Law Enforcement
- 20 Information Network, also known as LEIN, I confirmed that there
- 21 was previously felony convictions associated with Mr. Morgan.
- 22 Q. And what felony convictions did you determine that
- 23 Mr. Morgan had?
- 24 A. He was sentenced in 1999 for felony armed robbery, and
- 25 then also in 2006 for -- he pled to felon in possession in the

- 1 Western District of Michigan. In both cases, the first one
- 2 being a sentence in '99, he spent about four years in prison.
- 3 And then the following case in 2006, spent a little -- almost
- 4 six -- or over six. I'm sorry.
- 5 Q. Let's start with the 1999 case. You said that you
- 6 | obtained certified records; is that correct?
- 7 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 8 Q. And did you obtain certified records for the 1999 -- for
- 9 the 1998 case in which Mr. Morgan was sentenced in 1999;
- 10 correct?
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 Q. From the court?
- 13 A. I put a request in through the Third Circuit Court here
- 14  $\parallel$  in Wayne County and received certified court documents.
- 15  $\parallel$  Q. So that was Third Circuit in Wayne County where that --
- 16 Mr. Morgan was convicted of that offense?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And did you acquire those records? Were those records
- 19 provided for you?
- 20 A. Yes, they were.
- 21  $\blacksquare$  Q. And were those the records on which you relied to
- 22 determine that Mr. -- one record on which you relied to
- 23 determine that Mr. Morgan was a prohibited person?
- 24 A. It was.
- MS. ISON: Will you pull up Number 5?

```
1 BY MS. ISON:
```

- Q. I'm showing you what has been marked -- if you will, go to
- 3 Number 5. You have an exhibit book up there.
- 4 Government's Proposed Exhibit Number 5, do you
- 5 recognize that?
- 6 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 7 THE COURT: That should be up on your screen. Is it
- 8 | there?
- 9 THE WITNESS: It is, sir.
- 10 THE COURT: All right.
- 11 BY MS. ISON:
- 12 Q. Okay. And what is it?
- 13 A. That's a State of Michigan, Third Judicial Court Criminal
- 14 Division. It is a certified document of conviction.
- 15 Q. Of whose conviction?
- 16 A. Gemar Morgan.
- 17 Q. And what is the conviction?
- 18  $\blacksquare$  A. That is for two different things. Felony armed robbery
- 19 and felony firearm.
- 20  $\parallel$  Q. And what was the -- is there a sentence indicated on
- 21 there?
- 22 A. A sentence on July the 19th of 1999.
- 23 Q. And does it indicate what the sentence of imprisonment
- 24 was imposed by this court?
- 25 A. It does. Between -- let's see -- four to fifteen years.

- 1 | Q. And did you independently determine whether or not
- 2 Mr. Morgan had -- actually was imprisoned on this case?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. And what did you do? What did you determine with regards
- 5 to his term of imprisonment?
- 6 A. That he was imprisoned for over a year, making him by
- 7 definition a felon.
- 8 Q. And going to the conviction you mentioned in 2006 from --
- 9 you mentioned -- you indicated that it was from the Western
- 10 District?
- 11 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 12  $\parallel$  Q. Is that the Federal Court in the Western District?
- 13 A. It is.
- 14  $\parallel$  Q. And what did you learn about that particular conviction?
- 15  $\blacksquare$  A. In that conviction there was a plea that was obtained
- $16 \parallel$  between the United States and Mr. Morgan concerning a felon in
- 17  $\parallel$  possession. In that plea agreement it stated that he was, in
- 19 was in possession of a firearm at that time.
- 20 MS. ISON: Your Honor -- I'm sorry.
- 21 BY MS. ISON:
- 22 Q. Agent Weston, going back to Proposed Government's Exhibit
- 23 Number 5, there are two pages to that. Can you go to the
- 24 second page of that exhibit, please?
- 25 THE COURT: Well, he can't. Your technician is going

```
to have to flip it.
 2
               MS. ISON: Pardon me?
 3
               Oh, can you pull that up, please?
 4
               THE COURT: Are you asking for him to look at it on
 5
      the screen?
 6
               MS. ISON: Yes. She pulled it up, your Honor.
 7
               THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I have a hard copy as well.
 8
               MS. ISON:
                          I'm sorry about that.
 9
     BY MS. ISON:
10
        And what is that? Is that another -- is that part of the
11
     record that you received from the Third Circuit Court about
12
     Mr. Morgan's 1999 or 1998 conviction?
13
     Α.
         It is.
14
        And what does it reflect?
        It reflects that there is a conviction for -- there
15
16
     is a conviction; that a restitution payment was had; and that
17
     320 days was awarded time served.
18
         And does it also indicate that he was sentenced to four
19
     years to fifteen years for Count 2 for the armed robbery and
20
     two years for Count 3, the felony firearm?
21
     Α.
         It does.
22
               MS. ISON:
                          In addition to that, if you would please
23
      pull up Government's Exhibit 6, please.
24
     BY MS. ISON:
25
          Draw your attention to Government's Exhibit 6, Proposed
```

```
Exhibit 6, please.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: I don't have an Exhibit 6 on your list.
 3
               MS. ISON: Oh, we don't? We provided that, I
 4
      believe, to the Court, your Honor.
 5
               I believe it was provided to Defense Counsel and we
 6
      neglected to provide a copy to the Court.
 7
               Would the Court allow us to tender one to the Court
 8
      now?
 9
                          Well, actually, you have tendered one to
               THE COURT:
10
      me, but I don't have it on your exhibit list. So you're
11
      adding that?
12
               MS. ISON: Yes. Would the Court allow us to amend
      the exhibit list to include Government's Proposed Exhibit 6?
13
14
      And I can provide the Court with a copy that includes it
15
      already.
16
               THE COURT: Yes. That's part of the same conviction
      that is covered by Exhibit 5?
17
18
               MS. ISON: That is correct, your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: All right.
2.0
               MS. ISON:
                          It is.
21
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
     BY MS. ISON:
22
23
         And what is that in Government's Proposed Exhibit 6,
24
     Agent?
25
          This is the pretrial settlement offer between the
```

```
1 lacksquare Third Circuit Judicial Court and Mr. Morgan.
```

- 2 Q. Is this signed by Mr. Morgan?
  - A. It appears to be.
- 4 Q. And on what date was it signed?
- 5 A. It would be May 26 of 1999.
- Q. And what is your understanding of the pretrial settlement offer?
- 8 A. To my understanding, that means that there has been a plea
- g agreement or someone has pled guilty to the charges against
- 10 them.

- 11 Q. And based on the records you received from the Third
- 12 | Judicial Circuit Court about this case, the 1998 case in which
- 13 Mr. Morgan pleaded guilty in 1999 and sentence was in '99, it
- 14 | indicated that he had, in fact, pleaded guilty in that case; is
- 15 | that right?
- 16 A. Correct.
- MS. ISON: Your Honor, I move to admit Government's
- 18  $\parallel$  Exhibit 5 and 6, please.
- 19 THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, do you have any objections to
- 20 Exhibits 5 or 6?
- 21 DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes, your Honor. If you didn't
- 22 | have it in, if the Court didn't have it as an exhibit, I think
- 23 it's unconstitutional for it to, you know, be amended in
- 24 court.
- 25 THE COURT: Well, that's Number 6. Let's start with

```
Number 5. Do you have any objection to Number 5?
 1
 2
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Oh, yes. According to that
 3
      conviction, that conviction was discharged back in 2003, so
 4
      it's been over 16 years that that's been off my record.
 5
               THE COURT: What do you mean, it's been discharged?
 6
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I successfully completed and got a
 7
      certificate of rehabilitation.
 8
               THE COURT: All right. So what's the objection?
 9
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  That that was 20 years ago.
10
               THE COURT: All right.
                                       I don't find that that's
11
      a valid basis to object, so the objection is overruled.
12
      Exhibit 5 is received.
13
         (Received in Evidence: Exhibit Number 5.)
14
               THE COURT: What about Number 6?
15
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Oh, same scenario. In 2011 I
16
      received a certificate of rehabilitation, whereas, that
17
      conviction was discharged. I wasn't sentenced to life for
18
      either -- neither one of them crimes to where the Government
19
      is still, you know, punishing me for, you know, prior
20
      convictions where I done changed my life and don't partake
21
      in them conducts anymore. So I think it's unconstitutional
22
      for it to be produced into the court.
23
               THE COURT: All right. I appreciate your objection,
24
      but it does not state a valid legal ground. The objection is
25
      overruled and Exhibit 6 is received.
```

```
(Received in Evidence: Exhibit Number 6.)
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Proceed, counsel.
 3
     BY MS. ISON:
 4
          Agent Weston, with regard to Mr. Morgan's 1999 conviction
 5
     for armed robbery, did your research reveal in any way that
 6
     Mr. Morgan's rights to possess a firearm had been restored?
 7
          In all my investigation, no. There was no rights restored
     in any way that I saw, especially in getting your -- your
 8
 9
     non-prohibited status reversed. So if he was -- there was
10
     nothing.
11
          Did you see any orders or were you able to locate any
12
     orders in this record for the 1999 conviction for armed robbery
13
     from a court, from a judge in that court that revealed that
14
     Mr. Morgan's rights had been restored?
15
          I saw nothing.
16
          Drawing your attention to Government's Exhibit Number 3,
     you indicated that you also received or acquired certified --
17
18
               THE COURT: That's a proposed exhibit?
19
               MS. ISON:
                          Proposed exhibit. Thank you, your Honor.
20
               THE COURT:
                          Okay.
21
     BY MS. ISON:
22
          Proposed Exhibit Number 3, that you also acquired
23
     information from the Western District of Michigan, the United
24
     States District Court for the Western District of Michigan with
25
     regards to Mr. Morgan's conviction for felon in possession; is
```

- 1 that correct?
- 2 A. Correct.
- 3 Q. And I'm showing you Government's Proposed Exhibit 3. Is
- 4 | that what you acquired from that Court with regards to that
- 5 record or have you had an opportunity to review a certified
- 6 record that reflects that?
- 7 A. I have had a chance to review a certified record. On the
- 8 screen is the record that -- the certified record that I
- 9 examined.
- 10  $\blacksquare$  Q. And have you confirmed that with the information and
- 11 research that you learned about this particular conviction for
- 12 Mr. Morgan based on your research, your investigation, and any
- 13 law enforcement databases that you utilized to determine
- 14 Mr. Morgan's criminal record?
- 15 A. Correct. Yes. This is --
- 16  $\parallel$  Q. And what is the date of the -- what is that? What is
- 17 Government's Proposed Exhibit 3?
- 18  $\blacksquare$  A. It is a judgment in a criminal case out of the Western
- 19 District of Michigan, United States versus Gemar Morgan, for
- 20  $\parallel$  a 922(g)(1), which is felon in possession. And it was an
- 21  $\parallel$  agreement that was -- this is the front page of a plea
- 22 agreement.
- 23 Q. Read that again, Government's Proposed Exhibit --
- 24 A. I'm sorry, judgment in a criminal case. My apologies.
- 25 Q. Did you learn, however, that Mr. Morgan had, in fact,

```
pleaded guilty to this particular offense?
```

- 2 A. I did.
- 3 Q. In addition to that, did you also learn that Mr. -- any
- 4 sentence that Mr. Morgan received for this particular offense,
- 5 | the 2006 felon in possession conviction out of the Western
- 6 District?
- 7 A. I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?
- 8 Q. I'm sorry.
- 9 Did you determine whether or not Mr. Morgan had, in
- 10 fact, pleaded guilty to this particular offense?
- 11 A. Yes. He pled guilty to this offense.
- 12 Q. Okay. And do you know what he -- what, if any, sentence
- 13 he received as a result?
- 14 A. He was sentenced to prison for and served about six and a
- 15 half years.
- 16  $\parallel$  Q. And you said he served six and a half years for this
- 17 particular offense as well?
- 18 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 19 MS. ISON: Your Honor the Government moves to admit
- 20 Proposed Exhibit Number 3, please. Government Proposed
- 21 Exhibit Number 3.
- 22 THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, do you have an objection to
- 23 Exhibit Number 3?
- 24 DEFENDANT MORGAN: No. But I have questions.
- 25 THE COURT: I'm sorry?

```
DEFENDANT MORGAN: I have questions for the witness.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Do you want to wait until your turn or do
 3
     you want to ask about the exhibit?
 4
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  No.
 5
               THE COURT: All right. So you have no objection?
 6
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  No.
 7
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Exhibit Number 3
     is received.
 8
 9
         (Received in Evidence: Exhibit Number 3.)
     BY MS. ISON:
10
11
     Q. Did you have an opportunity --
12
               THE COURT: Ms. Ison, what do you want to do about
13
     publishing this to the jury?
              MS. ISON: Pardon me. We have -- we can make copies,
14
15
     your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Well, they have their screens. You
     haven't asked to --
17
18
              MS. ISON: We will have it available in the event
19
      that they need to see a hard copy of it.
20
               THE COURT: All right. You may proceed, then.
21
              MS. ISON: Oh, the -- I'm sorry. Oh, it's not
22
     published to the jury? I'm sorry.
23
               Yes, your Honor. We just ask that now that the
24
     exhibits are admitted they be published to the jury.
25
               THE COURT: Which ones?
```

```
MS. ISON: Government's Exhibit 3, 5, and 6.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Well, you can only do them one at a time.
               Members of the jury, jurors in the front row, grab
 3
 4
      the screen with both hands, one on each side, and pull it up,
 5
      just like that.
 6
               And this is Exhibit Number 3. Are you able to see
 7
      that?
 8
               MS. ISON: Your Honor, I do have a hard copy that I
 9
      can furnish to the jury.
10
               THE COURT: I think this is sufficient.
11
               MS. ISON: This is Number 3, your Honor, with regard
12
      to Mr. Morgan's prior conviction out of the Western District
13
      of Michigan for felon in possession of a firearm.
14
               THE COURT: Right. Do you wanted to publish 5 or 6?
15
               MS. ISON: Yes, your Honor. 5 and then 6 as well,
16
      please.
17
               THE COURT: All right. You can put up 5.
18
               MS. ISON:
                          Is that 5? Okay. And then 6, please.
19
               Then, your Honor, for purposes of completeness, your
20
      Honor, we would ask that Government's Exhibit 3 be published
21
      again, page 2, please.
22
               THE COURT: Oh, all right.
23
     BY MS. ISON:
24
        And if you would, Agent, turn to page 2 of the judgment.
25
     And does it indicate there the term of imprisonment that
```

- 1 Mr. Morgan received out of the Western District for being a
- 2 | felon in possession of a firearm?
- 3 A. It does.
- 4 | Q. What does it indicate there?
- 5 A. The Defendant is remanded to the custody of the United
- 6 States Marshals.
- 7 Q. Do you see under the term, imprisonment? Are you looking
- 8 at --
- 9 A. Oh, I'm sorry. I was too far. "Imprisonment. The
- 10 Defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United
- 11 States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of
- 12 | 78 months."
- 13 Q. And did you independently determine, approximately how
- 14 | much time did Mr. Morgan spend in prison on this particular
- 15 offense?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. And how much? How long was that?
- 18 A. About six years.
- 19 Q. Did your research or investigation reveal in any way
- 20 | whether Mr. Morgan's rights with regards to this particular
- 21  $\parallel$  conviction, that is, the 2006 conviction out of the Western
- 22 District for being a felon in possession of a firearm, that his
- 23 | rights had been restored in that case?
- 24 A. His rights had not been restored.
- 25 Q. Based on your investigation were you able to determine

```
whether or not Mr. Morgan is a prohibited person?
 2
          Mr. Morgan has been a prohibited person for quite a while
 3
     as exemplified by the sentencing in 1999, the sentencing in
 4
     2006.
 5
          Did you also participate -- did you also -- you have had
 6
     custody of the weapon, you indicated. Did you in any way
 7
     determine whether or not the weapon was functional?
 8
          I have.
     Α.
 9
          And do you have any experience with that?
10
     Α.
          I do.
11
          Have you fired several weapons?
     Q.
12
     Α.
          I have.
13
          Did you also participate in any way to determine that from
14
     a more legal perspective, if you will, determine that the gun
15
     actually functioned, the weapon functioned?
16
          Yes. Utilizing my training and experience as an ATF agent
17
     I took Exhibit 1 to the ATF test firing range and conducted two
18
     function tests on that firearm and the firearm functioned as
     designed. I did so in the presence of Special Agent Salazar.
19
20
               MS. ISON: No further questions of this witness, your
21
      Honor.
22
               THE COURT:
                          All right. Thank you.
23
               Mr. Morgan, you may ask questions now if you like,
24
      sir.
```

Yes.

DEFENDANT MORGAN:

## 1 CROSS EXAMINATION 2 BY DEFENDANT MORGAN: 3 Do you allege that the firearm traveled in interstate 4 commerce? 5 Through the investigation conducted by Special Agent Salazar, who is a nexus expert, he informed me through his 6 7 report that the firearm has, in fact, traveled through 8 interstate nexus. 9 And do you have an exact date when that transaction 10 occurred? 11 I do not. Α. 12 Do you allege that Mr. Morgan traveled across state line? 13 I do not know the travel history of Mr. Morgan. 14 Okay. According to your testimony, is it true that you 15 say my rights wasn't restored? 16 Correct. Α. 17 Are you familiar with the TSA and the Department of 18 Homeland Security? 19 I'm familiar with both of those agencies. 20 Okay. When they provide you with a background clearance, 21 what do that specify? 22 I do not know what you're referencing.

felon in 2013 from the TSA, which is the Transportation Safety

Administration and Department of Homeland Security. So my

Well, I received a background clearance from being a

23

24

25

Oh.

- 1 rights was restored.
- 2 A. I don't know what rights were restored in this particular
- 3 case between TSA and Homeland Security, but when it comes to
- 4 terms of being a prohibited person in the eyes of federal law
- 5 enforcement, being a prohibited person, there is a number of
- 6 items. One of those, one of those items is being a felon.
- 7 During our investigation at no time did we see anything that
- 8 would state that any rights were restored in the sense of being
- 9 able to possess a firearm.
- 10 Q. The Probation Department at this location, Ms. Trevino,
- 11 | she have records of my rights being restored, restored by TSA
- 12 and Department of Homeland Security. So --
- 13 A. I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.
- 14 | Q. No, I say, she have records of it, and you said you
- 16 investigation did you do on it?
- 17  $\blacksquare$  A. The investigation I conducted was going through to verify
- 18 that there are court-certified documents stating that the
- 19 Defendant is a convicted felon.
- 20  $\parallel$  Q. And stating that the Defendant is a convicted felon,
- 21 that's a lifetime condition?
- 22 A. As far as I -- I don't know if it's a lifetime condition,
- 23 but there has been no evidence of any sort of rights pertaining
- 24 | to ownership of a -- I'm sorry -- the possession of a firearm
- 25 that were uncovered during the investigation.

```
Q. So up under your expertise if a person is discharged from a prior sentence what would you define as discharged from a prior sentence?
```

- A. Could you please repeat the question?
- Q. What would you define as discharged from a prior sentence?
  - A. I don't -- I don't understand how to answer that.
- Q. Well, I can help you out a little bit.

MS. ISON: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, let me hear the question.

## BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

- Q. Actually, discharge from a prior sentence means to set free of all obligations and I met that criteria. I received certificates of rehabilitation. So I'm trying to understand, why would you label Mr. Morgan as a convicted felon when at the time of April 9, 19 -- 2019, Mr. Morgan wasn't serving no sentence, no probation, no parole, or owed no fines or restitutions?
- 18 ■ A. I'm sorry, can you -- so what's the question?
  - Q. What give you the legal grounds to claim Mr. Morgan as a convicted felon when at the time of April the 9th, 2019, Mr. Morgan wasn't serving no -- no sentence of imprisonment, probation or parole, fine or restitution, which defines felon?
- 23 A. Based off of certified court documents indicated, as I
- 24 have mentioned before, that Mr. Morgan is a convicted felon.
- 25 Q. Once again, did any of them court documents state that

- 1 Mr. Morgan was serving a lifetime sentence?
- 2 A. From my evaluation of the documents, a lifetime sentence
- 3 of imprisonment was not included as part of the -- any plea
- 4 agreement or any sentencing.
- 5 Q. Okay. Did you partake in the arrest of Mr. Morgan?
- 6 A. Did I partake -- I executed the felony arrest of
- 7 Mr. Morgan.
- 8 0. And what location that was at?
- 9 A. I obtained custody of Mr. Morgan at the Wayne County Jail.
- 10 Q. On April 9th, 2019, did you have a legal -- did you
- 11 partake in that arrest?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 | Q. Okay. Now, did you ever do a forensic lab report on that
- 14 | firearm?
- 15 A. I did not conduct a forensic lab report on this firearm.
- 16  $\parallel$  Q. Okay. Do you claim to be employed by an entity of the
- 17 Government that does professional work?
- 18 A. Could you please rephrase that question?
- 19 Q. Do you claim to be employed by an entity of the Government
- 20 that does professional work?
- 21  $\blacksquare$  A. I am a special agent with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,
- 22 Firearms, and Explosives.
- 23 Q. Okay. Did you retrieve any fingerprints from that
- 24 | firearm?
- 25 A. I did not retrieve any fingerprints from that firearm.

- Q. Have you ever lied under oath to cover up the truth?
- 2 A. No.
- 3 Q. Okay. Do you have knowledge of the interstate commerce?
- 4 A. I do not have -- I know of it.
- 5 Q. Are you familiar with the bill of lading that is required
- 6 in all interstate commerce transactions?
- 7 A. I don't know -- I do not know the policy that you're
- 8 referencing.
- 9 Q. It's Title 49 from the Code of Federal Regulations.
- MS. ISON: Objection, your Honor. The Court has
- 11 already ruled on this. It is irrelevant.
- DEFENDANT MORGAN: "Are you familiar." He answered
- 13 the question, are you familiar with the --
- 14 THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, do you have a response to the
- 15 | objection?
- 16 DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes. He was answering the
- 17 question.
- 18 THE COURT: The objection is sustained. It's
- 19 irrelevant. You may proceed.
- 20 BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
- 21 Q. Okay. Back to that. Do you allege that the firearm
- 22 traveled in interstate commerce?
- 23 A. Based on the report of Special Agent Salazar, the nexus
- 25 Q. Who traveled with that firearm?

- I do not know the history of the firearm. I only know that based off of the report from Special Agent Salazar, the 3 firearm was a part of an interstate nexus or has an interstate nexus.
  - What date was that firearm traveled?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- As I have mentioned before, I do not know the history of -- the manufacturing history or the travel history of that firearm.
- How could you claim that the firearm traveled in interstate commerce when you don't have no specific details?
- As I mentioned earlier, based on the report of Special Agent Salazar, nexus expert with the ATF, the firearm traveled through interstate nexus or has an interstate nexus.
- What's your definition of that, interstate nexus?

Objection, your Honor. MS. ISON:

THE COURT: What's the objection?

That is not for the witness to decide the MS. ISON: The law is clear that the law comes from the Judge as to the definition of interstate nexus.

THE COURT: No, I agree with that, and interstate nexus really is not part of the statute. The question is whether the firearm was in or affecting commerce, which is what the statute says.

But I think Mr. Morgan is trying to ask you what your understanding of that term is.

```
THE WITNESS: Understood.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Can you answer that?
 3
               THE WITNESS: Yes, I can.
 4
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
 5
               THE WITNESS: Interstate nexus means, is that if a
 6
      firearm was -- or any item was made in one state and traveled
 7
      to another state, that there is a nexus of interstate
 8
      commerce.
 9
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
10
        So my question to that: You basically saying interstate
11
     commerce is going from one state to another state?
12
        A product that is made in one state that travels to
13
     another state has a nexus of interstate commerce.
14
        Are you familiar with the constitutional -- give me one
15
     second, please.
16
               Are you familiar with Article I of the Constitution,
     Section 8, Clause 3, Congress's power to regulate commerce
17
18
     with foreign nations and among several states with the Indian
19
     tribes?
20
          I'm not familiar with what -- what you -- I don't know.
21
        Well, my question to you is, did Congress grant the power,
22
     grant Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, to regulate manufacturing
23
     or did it give Congress -- did it give the power to regulate
24
     commerce?
25
               MS. ISON: Objection as to relevance. And this
```

```
witness is not equipped to answer that question, your Honor.
 2
               THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
 3
               Do you have any further questions?
 4
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
 5
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
 6
          Is it possible for a police officer to make a mistake?
 7
     Α.
          Yes.
 8
          Is it possible that you have never made a mistake in life?
 9
          Unfortunately, yes, I have made mistakes in my life.
     Α.
10
          Okay. Okay. Did you ever conversate with Mr. Morgan
11
     about a semi-truck accident?
12
          Not that I recollect.
13
          Okay. According to April 9, 2019, where did you take
14
     Mr. Morgan?
15
          My relationship with Mr. Morgan did not begin on April 9
16
     of this year.
          When did it begin?
17
     Q.
18
          I believe on the 12th.
19
               THE COURT: Of April?
20
               THE WITNESS: Of April. I'm sorry, your Honor.
21
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
22
          And when you retrieved Mr. Morgan, did you receive
23
     property?
24
          There was property.
```

Was Mr. Morgan enhanced CDL included in that property?

- A. I don't recollect what property was with Mr. Morgan when
  I picked him up from Wayne County Jail.
  - Q. Is it safe to say that you don't remember what property you had retained?
- 5 A. I do not remember what was in -- what property was with
- 6 Mr. Morgan at the time that I was first -- we first met.
  - Q. Okay. What would you do if you witnessed police entrapment in your department?
- 9 MS. ISON: Objection, your Honor. Relevance. And it's a hypothetical, your Honor.
- 11 THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
- 12 BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:

4

7

8

15

- Q. Do you have any records of Mr. Morgan committing any crimes as a semi-truck driver?
  - A. No, I do not have any records of any crimes.
- Actually, there was a police report that was made in

  Illinois involving Mr. Morgan making threatening phone calls

  to a call center that initially got the interest of law

  enforcement.
  - Q. You say that initially got the attention of what?
- 21 A. I could -- I'm sorry, I can clarify.
- So a part of the investigation that I conducted

  pertaining to the Defendant included a police report that

  explained that someone that was identified as the Defendant was

  making threatening phone calls to an insurance call center and

```
that that call center/insurance Company made police reports
with that local PD. That local PD contacted MSP to find out
what was going on. They realized at that time that there was
an open arrest warrant for Mr. Morgan, and at that time, DFAT
was contacted.
    Are you testifying that the initial issue was from the
insurance Company?
Α.
    No.
    What was the initial warrant?
    There was an arrest warrant out of Allen Park, Michigan,
concerning -- I don't recollect the facts of that case. I just
know there was a valid warrant out of Allen Park, Michigan.
    And according to the MSP, could you detail exactly what
that stands for?
                    Objection. That calls for speculation,
         MS. ISON:
your Honor, when he says "according to MSP."
         THE COURT: What does "MSP" stand for?
         THE WITNESS: Michigan State Police.
         THE COURT: I think that was the question.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
    According to that, was Michigan State Police in charge of
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

22

- the investigation of the insurance Company?
- 24 I don't know what Michigan State Police -- their scope of 25 their investigation entailed.

```
Was you -- did you have any -- partake in the
 2
     investigation of that insurance Company?
 3
          I had no -- my investigation was solely to the facts of
 4
     the case that was, the Defendant had a loaded firearm in his
 5
     front pocket and he was a felon at the time of that possession.
 6
          And did you ever witness the -- Mr. Morgan traveling
 7
     across state line with a firearm?
 8
          The -- could you repeat the question?
 9
          Did you ever witness Mr. Morgan traveling across state
10
     line with a firearm?
11
          No.
     Α.
12
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I rest my case. No further
13
      questions, your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: Do you have any further questions?
15
                          Just a couple of follow-up.
               MS. ISON:
                           REDIRECT EXAMINATION
16
17
     BY MS. ISON:
18
          You indicated that you were made aware that there was an
19
     outstanding warrant out of Allen Park for Mr. Morgan's arrest;
20
     correct?
21
          Correct.
     Α.
22
          In what county is Allen Park located?
23
          Boy, I want to say it's Wayne County.
     Α.
```

Morgan up at the Wayne County Jail.

Okay. And because you already testified that you picked

24

```
A. I did.
```

- Q. And why was he at the Wayne County Jail?
- 3 A. He was at the Wayne County Jail pending the -- how he got
- 4 | there, I do not know, but he was waiting for federal charges,
- 5 so there was a hold on his state arrest warrant that pending
- 6 federal charges were coming.
- 7  $\blacksquare$  Q. So did you look -- determine whether or not he was there
- 8 | after having been arrested on the arrest warrant out of
- 9 Allen Park?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. In addition to that you talked about interstate nexus and
- 12 you said that when a gun or a product travels from one state to
- 13 another there is an interstate nexus.
- 14 When you say nexus, what do you mean by that?
- 15 ■ A. I'm sorry, that there is a -- I'll use the term,
- 16 correlation or relationship between traveling from one state,
- 17  $\parallel$  being manufactured in one state and then traveling to another,
- 18 that there is a history of or there is a connection to
- 19 traveling between states.
- 20  $\mathbb{Q}$ . And does that also mean that it crossed state lines then?
- 21 A. It did.
- 22 MS. ISON: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?
- 23 THE COURT: Yes.
- 24 BY MS. ISON:
- 25 📗 ///

- 1 Q. Agent Kenton, you have already testified that you are
- 2 | familiar with Government's Exhibit 1.
- 3 A. I am.
- 4 Q. What is that again?
- 5 A. This is a -- Exhibit 1 is a Raven Arms MP25 .25 caliber
- 6 semi-automatic pistol.
- Q. Based on your investigation in that case, is that the gun,
- 8 the weapon that was recovered from Mr. Morgan?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Have you had an opportunity to observe that weapon
- 11 personally yourself?
- 12 A. I have.
- 13 Q. Have you noticed anything on that weapon that indicates to
- 14  $\parallel$  you that that weapon traveled in interstate commerce, in that
- 15 | it crossed state lines?
- 16 A. I do.
- 17  $\blacksquare$  Q. And what is that?
- 18 A. There is a marking on the slide of the pistol indicating
- 19 | that it was manufactured in the state of California.
- 20 Q. And to your knowledge, do you know whether or not Raven
- 21 | Arms, which you have already testified, the manufacturer of
- 22 that weapon, if Raven Arms ever had a manufacturing Company in
- 23 the state of Michigan?
- 24 A. Never.
- 25  $\parallel$  Q. Based on your training and experience; is that correct?

- A. Based on my training and experience and the information provided to me by other ATF agents.
- Q. Are you aware, after a person is convicted of a crime and they serve a sentence, if they are -- if there are any other conditions imposed on them after --
- 6 A. There are.
- 7 | Q. -- after being released from prison?
- 8 A. Correct.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. And did you determine whether or not Mr. Morgan had served on any supervisory probation or anything as a -- or parole after serving his time in prison for both of the 1998 conviction and the 2006?

DEFENDANT MORGAN: Objection, your Honor. That's a form of coercion. I mean, that's not a direct question.

That's basically asking him a question and giving him an answer in the same phrase.

THE COURT: Yeah, that would be a leading question.

But that form is not leading, and so the objection is overruled.

THE WITNESS: Could you please repeat the question?
BY MS. ISON:

Q. Are you aware of whether or not Mr. Morgan served on parole or any other -- in any other -- under any other supervision following his term of imprisonment for the 1999 armed robbery?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. And what do you know about that?
- 3  $\blacksquare$  A. That he was paroled and then violated parole and was sent
- 4 back to prison.
- 5 Q. And at some point was he discharged from that parole?
- 6 A. He was.
- 7 | Q. And was that -- discharged from that sentence; is that
- 8 correct?
- 9 A. Correct.
- 10 Q. Based on your training and experience, is that the same as
- 11 | having your rights restored to possess a firearm?
- 12 A. It is not.
- 13 | Q. What is the difference?
- 14  $\blacksquare$  A. The difference is that there is a process that needs to --
- 15 ■ that needs to happen in order for you to have your rights
- 16 restored. Completing your imprisonment is not one of them.
- 17 | Q. Well, it might be one of them.
- 18 A. I'm sorry, it's not the only one. I apologize.
- 19 Q. In addition to that, the same thing with regard to the
- 20 2006 conviction for felon in possession of a firearm, do you
- 21 know whether or not Mr. Morgan was on any supervisory -- under
- 22 any supervisory conditions following his term of imprisonment
- 23 in that case?
- 24 A. According to the court-certified document, yes.
- 25 Q. And do you know whether or not -- you have already

```
testified that you see no evidence that his rights had been
 2
     restored from that conviction as well; is that correct?
 3
          Correct.
     Α.
 4
                          I have no further questions, your Honor.
               MS. ISON:
 5
               THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, do you have further
 6
      questions?
 7
               DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                                  Yes.
 8
               THE COURT:
                           Go ahead.
                            RECROSS EXAMINATION
 9
10
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
11
          You just testified that the nexus is crossing state lines?
12
     Α.
          Yes.
13
          Who do you allege -- who do you allege crossed state
14
     lines?
15
          I'm -- I can't give a hypothetical answer. I don't know.
16
          Do you allege Mr. Morgan crossed state line?
     Q.
17
          I do not know the travel history of Mr. Morgan.
     Α.
18
          Did you witness Mr. Morgan traveling across state line?
     Q.
          I do not know the travel history of Mr. Morgan.
19
20
          You also said that my rights wasn't restored. The police
21
     department, the law enforcement agents, they have my CDL, and
22
     on my CDL you can see the hazmat endorsement on it which
23
     requires you, in order to get a hazmat endorsement on a CDL,
24
     you have to have your rights restored.
25
               MS. ISON: Objection, your Honor. Defendant, first
```

```
of all, is testifying and hasn't asked a question. And it's
 2
      not relevant.
 3
               THE COURT: It really isn't relevant, Mr. Morgan.
 4
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
 5
          Well, do you -- do you know what happened to my CDL --
 6
     enhanced CDL license?
 7
     Α.
        No.
 8
        And what factual basis do you have to present to the Court
 9
     to show that my rights wasn't restored?
10
          I have no documents to say that his rights were restored.
11
     I have -- in order to have your rights restored in order to
12
     possess a firearm after being a convicted felon, that there
13
     needs to be some sort of documentation. No documentation
14
     showing that that right was restored was located.
15
               THE COURT: Did you look for it?
16
               THE WITNESS: Yes.
17
               THE COURT: All right.
18
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
19
        According to the CDL, enhanced CDL license, that can
20
     easily be proven, but law enforcements has that in they
21
     possession.
22
               MS. ISON:
                          Same objection.
23
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
24
          Do you have my CDLs in your possession?
25
               THE COURT: Do you have an objection?
```

```
Objection as to relevance. And it's been
 1
               MS. ISON:
 2
      asked and answered, and the Court has already ruled on the
 3
      same question.
 4
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Your Honor --
 5
               THE COURT: You keep asking -- go ahead.
 6
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: It's only one way that we can
 7
      prove that my rights been restored. Law enforcement took my
 8
      property. They got my CDL, enhanced CDL license. It can be
 9
      proven that -- based on my CDL license that my rights was
10
      restored.
11
               THE COURT: I don't think that that's an accurate
12
      statement of the law, Mr. Morgan.
13
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: The requirements to get a hazmat --
14
               THE COURT: Mr. Morgan, I'm not going to argue with
15
      you about it. We have been over this already, and I have
16
      already sustained objections.
               Now, do you have any additional questions for this
17
18
      witness?
19
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
20
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
21
        You go back to where you testified that the gun, you know,
22
     crossed state lines.
23
               Do you have any documentations showing when that gun
24
     crossed state line?
25
          As I have noted earlier, that the manufacturer was in the
```

- state of Nevada and that for this gun to come to the state of
  Michigan indicates that it has crossed state lines.
  - Q. Do you have any documentation, I asked.
- 4 A. The only -- the documentation that I'm relying upon is
- 5 the report provided by nexus expert, ATF Special Agent David
- 6 Salazar.

- 7 | Q. Okay. What date did that gun cross state line?
- 8 A. I do not know the travel history of this firearm or the
- 9 manufacturing history of this firearm.
- 10 Q. Do you know who crossed state line with the firearm?
- 11 A. I do not know the travel history of this firearm.
- 12 Q. So your testimony, what are you testifying to, based on
- 13 the gun crossing state line, if you don't know the travel
- 14 history?
- 15 A. This firearm was manufactured by Raven Arms in the state
- 16  $\parallel$  of California. In order for it to arrive to the state of
- 17 | Michigan, it has to cross multiple states. I do not know the
- 18 | history of the travel of that firearm, other than the fact that
- 19 it was made in one state and traveled to this state, and it was
- 20 | located in the front pants pocket of the Defendant.
- 21 Q. Did you retrieve that?
- 22 A. No.
- 23 Q. How do you know it was retrieved from the front pocket of
- 24 the accused?
- 25 A. Based off the report -- the MSP -- I'm sorry -- Michigan

```
State Police report provided by --
               THE COURT: Mr. Weston, you understand here you're
 2
      supposed to testify on the basis of personal knowledge; right?
 3
 4
               THE WITNESS: I apologize, your Honor.
 5
               THE COURT: Okay.
 6
               THE WITNESS: I don't know. I wasn't there.
 7
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
 8
          Well, based on your knowledge and your expertise as a
 9
     professional entity of the Government, do you have fingerprints
10
     of that firearm?
11
          Can you please repeat the question?
          Did you ever retrieve fingerprints of that firearm based
12
13
     on your professional expertise?
14
               I did not conduct any sort of fingerprint analysis.
15
          What about a forensic lab report?
        No. No forensic lab report was created. Due to policy,
16
     if a firearm is located on a person no DNA swabs are done
17
     because it's been found on that person.
18
19
          Okay. What is the method of proving that -- what is the
20
     method of proving fingerprints in a matter that a person
21
     possessed a firearm?
22
               MS. ISON:
                          Objection, your Honor. It's beyond the
23
      scope of redirect.
24
               THE COURT: It is. Mr. --
25
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I object, your Honor.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
THE COURT: No, you don't object. The Government
           The objection is that it's beyond the scope of the
objected.
questions that Ms. Ison asked this witness. And this witness
really had nothing to do with fingerprints and he never
testified to that. So if you cross examine him on that, it
really has nothing to do with his testimony.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: He testified that it came out of
my front pocket.
                     Right. And he then retracted that by
         THE COURT:
saying he didn't know that for sure.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: No further questions, your Honor.
         THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anything else?
                    Just a couple.
         MS. ISON:
                 FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. ISON:
    Based upon your position as the agent in charge of this
case, did you have an opportunity to discuss this case with the
other people involved in Mr. Morgan's arrest?
Α.
    Yes.
    And did you review reports with that regard?
Α.
    Yes.
    And did you learn information about the circumstances of
Mr. Morgan's arrest on April 9 of 2019?
Α.
    Yes.
          Based on your training and experience does
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
obtaining a commercial driver's license have anything to do
with the restoration of a person's rights after having been
convicted of a felony?
Α.
    It does not.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: Objection, your Honor.
         THE COURT: What's the objection?
         DEFENDANT MORGAN: It wasn't anything about obtaining
       The restoration is the enhanced -- I mean, the hazmat,
because with the hazmat endorsement you got to -- I had to
have my rights restored, because I did have --
         THE COURT: I understand your position, but that
doesn't mean the question is improper, so the objection is
overruled.
         Any further questions?
BY MS. ISON:
    Based on your training and experience, anything with
regards of receiving an enhanced or a commercial driver's
license that has the hazmat that has anything to do with the
restoration of a person's rights after they have been
committed -- I'm sorry -- convicted of a felony?
   No. A restoration in terms of a driver's license, pilot's
license, or boating license has nothing to do with the
restorations of your rights or reversal of being a prohibited
person.
         MS. ISON: Nothing further, your Honor. Thank you.
```

1	THE COURT: Do you have questions?
2	FURTHER RECROSS EXAMINATION
3	BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
4	Q. Do the restoration of your rights have anything to do with
5	receiving a background clearance from TSA and Department of
6	Homeland Security?
7	A. I don't know what the terms of TSA and Homeland Security
8	are for the restoration of that. But when it pertains to a
9	prohibited person in terms of possessing a firearm, they are
10	not mutually exclusive.
11	Q. Once again, in order to receive a background clearance
12	from TSA or Department of Homeland Security, do it have
13	anything to do with restoring your rights?
14	A. I don't know.
15	DEFENDANT MORGAN: No further questions, your Honor.
16	FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY MS. ISON:
18	Q. Which agency is responsible for or governs prohibited
19	persons possessing firearms?
20	A. I believe the ATF.
21	Q. And that's your agency; right?
22	A. Yes, ma'am.
23	Q. And you know what is required in order to determine
24	whether or not someone's rights have been restored after having
25	been convicted of a felony; is that correct?
I	

```
I'm familiar with the process.
 2
          Does clearing a background check for purposes of getting a
 3
     job or a CDL license or anything else have anything to do with
 4
     the restoration of a prohibited person's right to possess a
 5
     firearm, based on your training and experience?
 6
          Based on my training and experience, that is not a factor.
 7
               MS. ISON:
                          Thank you. Nothing further, your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Morgan?
 9
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
10
                        FURTHER RECROSS EXAMINATION
11
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
12
          Based on a person receiving they -- restoring they rights,
13
     is a firearm considered an explosive?
14
          I don't understand the question.
15
               MS. ISON objection as to relevance, your Honor.
16
     BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
          I'm asking you, is a firearm considered an explosive?
17
18
               THE COURT: The objection is that it's irrelevant.
19
      Do you have a response?
2.0
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
21
               THE COURT: What's the response?
22
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I have a direct question to the
23
      restoration of my rights, because in order to haul explosives,
24
      which is a placard as firearms, that's what the -- if you
```

hauling firearms, ammunition, you going to have to placard

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
your semi truck with an explosive. So in order to get your
rights restored is that's part of -- is that's part of getting
your rights restored to be able to haul explosives, which is
firearms and ammunition, bombs, fireworks.
         THE WITNESS: I don't understand your question.
BY DEFENDANT MORGAN:
   Based on a prohibited person, can a prohibited person
transport firearms, explosives, bombs, fireworks, ammunitions,
and firearms?
Α.
    No.
         DEFENDANT MORGAN:
                            Thank you, your Honor.
         MS. ISON: Nothing further, your Honor. Thank you.
         THE COURT: Thank you. You may stand down.
         Members of the jury, we're going to conclude our
session today. We have -- there are some legal matters that
we have to take up on this case tomorrow morning before we get
you back into the courtroom, so rather than 8:30, I suggest
you come back in at 9:30.
         So why don't you try to get here about 9:15, check in
on the fifth floor, wait there until Ms. Pinkowski comes to
get you to bring you up to the jury room, and then we will
hopefully conclude the case and get it to you for your
```

case among yourselves. Do not try to gather any information

In the meantime, though, please do not discuss the

determination sometime during the day tomorrow.

```
about the case or anything that we have discussed in court or
      any of the individuals on your own. Remember, you have to
 2
 3
      decide the case based solely on what you have seen and heard
 4
      here in the courtroom.
 5
               You may retire to the jury room right now and just
 6
      wait there for a few minutes before we discharge you for the
 7
      day.
 8
               Would you escort the jury out, please?
 9
               THE CLERK: All rise for the jury.
10
         (Jury left courtroom at 4:09 p.m.)
11
               THE COURT: You may be seated.
12
               Will the Government have any additional evidence?
13
               MS. ISON: No, your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: You will want to rest, then, tomorrow
15
      morning before the jury?
16
               MS. ISON: Yes, your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Morgan, do you intend to
18
      testify on your own behalf tomorrow?
19
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: It's a possibility, your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: All right. You understand that the
21
      choice is yours?
22
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
23
               THE COURT: You have a right to testify, but you also
24
      have the right to remain silent. Do you understand that?
25
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: All right. So would you let me know in
 2
      the morning what your choice is?
 3
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: I got a guick guestion.
 4
               THE COURT: All right.
 5
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: If the testimony is to assert
 6
      various laws and case laws, would that be accepted?
 7
               THE COURT: No. You would not be able to testify
      about what you think the law is. The law is what I will
 8
 9
      instruct the jury on.
10
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Okay.
11
               THE COURT: And if you wish to consult with
12
      Ms. Raben, maybe she can give you some advice. You don't have
13
      to take it if you don't want to, but she is available.
14
               I will want him back here by 8:15 tomorrow morning
15
      because I want to make sure Ms. Raben has some draft jury
16
      instructions, and you can present them to him.
17
               MS. RABEN: Your Honor, are you aware that he --
18
      transport did not arrive until almost 9:00?
19
               THE COURT: Yeah, I am aware of that, and that's not
20
      the way it should have gone. And I'm not sure why that is,
21
      but I intend to look into it.
               MS. RABEN: Has the Court ever seen inbound 96 or 275
22
23
      in the morning?
24
               THE COURT:
                          Unfortunately, yes, I have. So that
25
      means to arrive at a particular time, and if there is some
```

```
difficulties, that means you have to start out earlier.
 1
 2
               MS. RABEN: Your Honor, if I were transporting, I
 3
      would be happy to drive out to Livingston County and get him
 4
      here by 8:15.
 5
               THE COURT: I don't accept that you would be happy to
 6
      do that, although you might be willing.
 7
               MS. RABEN:
                          Yes.
                          In any event, make sure you get him
 8
               THE COURT:
 9
      transported here so he arrives at 8:15.
10
               Ms. Raben, if you will stop by chambers I'll get you
11
      a draft of some jury instructions. I'll make those available
12
      to the Government at the same time. And then I hope to have a
13
      charge conference in the courtroom tomorrow so that we can go
14
      over that.
15
               MS. RABEN:
                          Okay.
16
               THE COURT:
                          And then by then, Mr. Morgan, maybe you
      can tell me whether you would like to testify or not. All
17
18
      right?
19
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Okay. Could I just ask her one
      question?
20
21
               THE COURT: Sure. Of course.
22
         (Discussion held off the record at 4:12 p.m.)
23
               MS. RABEN: Your Honor, Mr. Morgan has a question and
24
      I think it's in relation to a jury instruction.
25
               THE COURT: What's the question?
```

```
DEFENDANT MORGAN: Just so the jury won't be
 1
      confused, is it possible that you can actually citate the
 2
 3
      actual statute for Title 18 U.S.C. 922(q)? Is it possible
 4
      that you can include that as a jury instruction?
 5
               THE COURT: You want the actual text of the statute
 6
      you're charged with?
 7
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Yes.
 8
               THE COURT: I usually don't do that, but I don't
 9
      think the Government has an objection to that.
10
               MS. ISON: We don't. No objection, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: All right. I'll include that.
12
               DEFENDANT MORGAN: Thanks, your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: All right. If there is nothing further,
14
      then, this matter will stand in recess. We will see you all
15
      tomorrow morning.
16
               MS. ISON: Thank you, your Honor.
17
                    (Proceedings adjourned at 4:13 p.m.)
18
19
                      CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER
20
21
               I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
22
        from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
23
24
                  s/ Rene L. Twedt
                                                June 26, 2020
     RENE L. TWEDT, CSR-2907, RDR, CRR, CRC
                                                 Date
25
         Federal Official Court Reporter
```